

Also, petition of Beal Byron Co., of New York, protesting against any restrictions being placed on motor boats; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Nelson O. Tiffany, jr., of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of citizens of Ford County, Kans., against passage of bills for Sunday closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Larned, Kans., against passage of House bill 8348; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Morton County, Kans., favoring amending the pending joint committee bill on rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of citizens of Fort Dodge, Kans., against passage of bills to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Samuel M. Newmark and 54 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woman's Civic Club of Fortuna, Cal., favoring appropriation of \$300,000 for Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of S. M. Hughes and three other citizens of Los Angeles; J. Vaughan, San Pedro; and Charles C. Townsend, Lancaster, all in the State of California, favoring the Warren bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Home Investment Building & Loan Association and Metropolitan Loan Association, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring relief from Federal emergency excise-tax act; to the committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Schiller Lodge, No. 34, Sons of Herman, and Louis Karl and 23 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring embargo on munitions of war, and protesting against loans to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Beaumont, Cal., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, letters from Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the formation of a new land district to include Imperial County and the eastern portion of Riverside County; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Pedic Society of San Francisco, Cal., favoring bill to regulate the practice of pediatry or chiropody in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Bakers' Union No. 25, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring House bill 137, investigation into sanitary conditions surrounding the marketing of dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of Prof. William C. Farrar, Bethel College, Kentucky, against erecting power plant near Washington Monument; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of citizens of Fort Morgan, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Northeastern Weld County (Colo.) Educational Association, Esther L. Shanebo, Coleman, Colo., president, against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Union League Club of Chicago, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am not going to ask to have read the mass of telegrams I have received and which I have before me begging the Senate to retain section 56 in the bill. I am simply going to call attention to the fact that they come from sources not interested in these encampments, but men who are anxious to see a proper measure enacted that will assist in raising a volunteer force.

I have before me 356 telegrams coming from New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Portland, Oreg., New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other points than the cities I have named in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Montana, Virginia, Delaware, and Vermont. Some of the telegrams are from officers of the National Guard of these States. I have one particularly from a gentleman in Oregon who has been adjutant general of the State for a great many years, who served with the Second Oregon Volunteers in the Philippines as a major and was afterwards judge advocate general in the Philippines, and he favors section 56 very strongly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	McCumber	Sherman
Bankhead	Harding	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Beckham	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hughes	Nelson	Smoot
Broussard	Husting	Norris	Sterling
Burleigh	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Stone
Catron	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones	Overman	Taggart
Chilton	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Clapp	Kern	Pittman	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Pomerene	Underwood
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Warren
Cummins	Lewis	Saulsbury	Weeks
Dillingham	Lippitt	Shafroth	Williams
du Pont	Lodge	Sheppard	Works

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I wish also to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to announce the absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. He has been called to his State on pressing business.

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I started to make a brief statement awhile ago and was interrupted by the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and I will make it now.

Since the Senate adjourned yesterday afternoon I have received about 360 telegrams, including some that have just come to me since I started my former statement. The telegrams are from citizens of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Portland, Oreg., and also from different cities in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Montana, Virginia, Delaware, and Vermont, protesting against the elimination of section 56 from the bill. I desire to say that these telegrams come from persons who attended the Plattsburg and similar training camps, and many officers of the State militia—of the National Guard, I should probably say—veterans of the Spanish-American War, and others.

One of the strongest protests against the elimination of this section is from Judge Gantenbein, of Portland, Oreg., which reached me this morning, calling attention to the fact that he had seen the statement in the early morning papers, the midnight edition of the papers, about what was done here. Judge Gantenbein is one of the circuit judges of my city. For a number of years he was adjutant general of the State. He was an officer in the Second Oregon Volunteer Regiment in the Philippines, and served during the occupation as judge advocate, and has had very broad experience. He protests most strenuously against the elimination of section 56.

I have also a characteristic telegram, which I will read, from a guardsman, dated at Baltimore, this morning. He says:

As a member of the first training regiment, Plattsburg, 1915, and also as first lieutenant, Maryland National Guard, emphatically urge the passage of section 56 of Senate military bill.

J. CRAIG McLANAHAN.

Another is from New Jersey, which says:

As a militiaman of 25 years' enlisted and commissioned service I emphatically protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan embodied section 56 Senate bill and urge passage of this section; also against amendment attaching militia officers to General Staff to control militia affairs, this being opposed to sound development and future effectiveness of militia.

ARTHUR H. MACKIE,  
Major, First New Jersey Infantry.

I call attention to these telegrams. I will not ask to have them read into the Record, but I desire to have a record made of the fact that I have received these telegrams, all protesting against the elimination of section 56.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegrams will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record a letter and a number of telegrams received from citizens of the State of New York and elsewhere protesting against the elimination of section 56 in the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter and telegrams referred to are as follows:

HON. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
New York City, April 5, 1916.  
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: The present Congress is engaged upon consideration of two questions which vitally affect the future of this country.

1. The increase in the Standing Army, including reorganization of the State militia.

2. The increase in our naval program, including increase in the personnel of the Navy.

History unquestionably teaches us that the country which is not prepared to meet other countries upon at least an equal war footing is doomed to recede from the position which it otherwise would hold in the community of nations, and by reason of its consequent inability to enforce respect for its rights and the privileges of its citizens by so much forfeits the respect of the other nations of the world.

Our present Standing Army, from the standpoint of personnel and equipment, is so ridiculously inadequate as to make us a laughing stock among the other nations of the world. By this I do not mean to imply that man for man our Army, the personnel of our Regular Army, will not equal in efficiency that of any other nation of the world. But that will not win battles against superior forces. As my Senator I write to emphasize upon you that as one of your constituents I am most emphatically in favor of an increase in our Standing Army to at least 250,000 men, providing at the same time for an adequate reserve.

I am also in favor of more thorough training of the State militia and a coordination of the various units thereof, so as to subject it to centralized control. In this connection I consider the Hay bill worse than no provision whatever for the necessities of our present case, and I trust that you will do everything in your power to defeat that bill and to bring about the passage of a bill establishing our military policy upon the broadest lines.

As to the Navy, our Navy is not only our first weapon of offense, but, as the situation now stands, our first and only effective weapon of defense. The coast line which the United States would have to protect in the event of hostilities is many times greater than that of any other country with which we might come into conflict and our Navy considerably smaller than that of any such country. We have a considerably more effective machine in our Navy to-day than we have in our Army, but owing to the unfortunate policy of the present administration this effectiveness is potential rather than actual.

I am emphatically in favor of bringing our Navy to 100 per cent effectiveness and for increasing the size of the Navy proportionately to the extent of our coast line and its requirements in the event of hostilities. This means an energetic prosecution of a naval program substantially as recommended by the General Board of the Navy.

Many good citizens are fearful lest the present Congress will attempt to foist upon the Nation a bill with regard to the Navy similar in its effect to the Hay bill.

I trust that you will do everything in your power to oppose such destructive legislation and to effect adequate constructive legislation in this respect.

Very truly, yours,

ALFRED ELY.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge you to make every effort to prevent defeat of section 56, Senate military bill; we need training camps.

GUSTAV SCWAW.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Volunteer Army movement must not be jeopardized by politics. I went to Plattsburg, finished the march in the ambulance, and have gotten many men to go this year. They most decidedly would not join the Guard.

CONRAD G. GODDARD,  
Roslyn, Long Island, N. Y.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully urge upon you the necessity of approving section 56 in the Senate bill on military organization now under consideration. I feel very strongly about this.

J. A. RIPLEY.

Hon. JAMES O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan in section 56 of Senate bill, and emphatically urge passage of this section.

F. B. Marshall, Halsey French, William Meadowcroft, Alexander S. Farmer, Alfred W. Arenader, Alfred A. Schener, Geo. A. Griffin, Wm. Lamson, Wm. J. Coakley, Geo. J. Bourke, Thomas C. Norton, Arthur S. Tuttle, Vernon S. Moon, Arthur H. Pratt, Aswald W. Hill, Kenneth Allen, John E. Hill, Wm. I. Foster, F. X. A. Purcell, A. G. Thomas, H. M. Foster.

Senator O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Vote against Lee amendment; section 56 must be retained.

ALEXANDER GORDON,  
61 Broadway, New York.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Request you vote against Lee amendment striking out section 56.

THEODORE T. LANE.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

As a member of the first Plattsburg training regiment, I emphatically protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill, and urge upon you the passage of this section which practically contemplates a national system of Plattsburg camps.

JOSEPH J. FRANK,  
New York City.

Senator O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Emphatically indorse section 56 of Senate military bill. The opportunity to serve Nation in a Federal force would make available not less than hundred thousand men annually who can not or will not join any State militia.

DELANCEY K. JAY.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I urge emphatically adoption section 56, Senate Army bill, and protest utmost indignation attempt defeat it.

HERBERT K. STOCKTON,  
27 William Street.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Plattsburg Chamber of Commerce protests against the dropping from the Army bill of section 56, providing for a Federal reserve. We regard this section as based upon the fundamental duty of citizenship, the duty of national defense, and as a step toward a broader recognition of this duty.

W. J. JAKUES,  
President Plattsburg Chamber of Commerce.

Senator O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Emphatically urge passage section 56, Federal reserve bill.

FRANK DAWSON.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly believe that section 56 of Senate bill 4840 should be retained, because I think that a Federal reserve is the most effective means of defense and that voluntary training camps, such as were held at Plattsburg last summer, should be permanently established by law.

W. R. BEGG,  
24 Broad Street, New York City.

Hon. JAMES O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I have followed closely the newspaper accounts of the course of the proposed military legislation in Congress. I understand that there is opposition to section 56 of Senate bill No. 4840. I earnestly hope that you will use your efforts to overcome this opposition.

A. L. HUMES,  
Plaza Hotel, New York City.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to the national defense bill now pending before the Senate, we heartily indorse the Regular Army increase and the Federal reserve plans as now embodied in the bill. In view of the inadequacy for national defense of any Regular Army which the American people will support, in view of the collapse of the State militia as a national defensive system in every crisis of our history, and in view of the uselessness of untrained volunteers in modern war, we most emphatically protest against any weakening of the Federal reserve provisions unless there is provided the only adequate substitute, universal military training under exclusive Federal control.

F. G. Sheridan, Albert Buttendorf, Fred E. Moore, Wm. W. Kerr, Geo. Fuchs, Chas. R. Cockey, Chester W. Allen, W. J. Buhrendorf, J. L. Murphy, David Kurtzweg, L. P. Wood, F. H. Robbins, Frederick F. Dibbelins, Jos. S. Stull, Jr., Allen E. Shannon, Clifford Zaver, Adam H. Brenzinger, Geo. R. Farwill, John W. Langguth, Torris Elde, H. O. Tafel, J. Howard Williams, Alexander H. Fox, W. J. Cormack.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I hope you will use your influence to secure approval of section 56 in Senate bill regarding training camps. I am satisfied from my personal experience at Plattsburg that these camps are a necessary aid in national defense.

FRANCIS W. AYMAR.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.



NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of Senate bill 4840, because my experience at Plattsburg last summer convinces me that the plan is of the greatest value as a measure of defense. The plan in no way conflicts with the interests of the National Guard, of which I am a member, and it gives an opportunity for military training to men who can not belong to the National Guard. It also offers to members of the National Guard a chance for a supplementary training under conditions approximating those of actual service. I have seen something of both methods of training, and I wish to say very earnestly that if there were any necessity of choosing between the two the Federal reserve would be more efficient and reliable.

HOWARD H. BROWN,  
116 West Sixty-ninth Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 4, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Military Training Camps Association of the United States of 4,200 men from all sections who have attended Federal training camps, and representing also not less than 30,000 citizens who will attend this year's camps, at a cost of \$2,000,000 to themselves, we earnestly protest against attempt to defeat section 56, Senate military bill. This section, without impairing National Guard, will make available for service of Nation tens of thousands who under no circumstances can be made available under a National Guard system.

MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS ASSOCIATION  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

As a member of first training regiment, I wish to protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill, and emphatically urge the passage of this section.

WILLIAM S. SEAMAN, JR.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Esq.,  
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I protest against attempt to kill training-camps movement. Pass section 56 of Senate bill and give us a chance to defend our lives and honor in case of war.

EDMOND PATTEN GLOVER.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As a thorough believer in Federal training-camps movement, I sincerely hope that the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of Senate bill will become law, and I desire to enter a vigorous protest against alleged attempt to defeat this provision. Any modification of Chamberlain bill in direction of weak, deceptive, and wasteful Hay bill would be national misfortune. If Congress appreciated the widespread national determination for adequate military and naval preparedness and favoring complete federalization of all military forces and acceptance of the recommendations of General Staff, the Chamberlain bill would be passed by overwhelming majority.

ARCHIBALD G. TEACHER,  
59 Wall Street.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I attended the Plattsburg business men's camp last summer and am a member of the New York National Guard. In my opinion, the plan embodied in section 56 of Senate bill 4840 offers every opportunity to create a reserve of far greater efficiency and reliability than a federalized militia National Guard. Opposition to this section is utterly unjustifiable, even on the assumption that a federalized militia will be as reliable and as efficient as a reserve created under section 56. To constitute a federalized National Guard the only reserve is to discriminate against men who are willing and anxious to serve in a reserve, but who for business or other reasons are unable or unwilling to join the National Guard. Furthermore, section 56 should be retained because it put the military training camps upon a permanent basis, and thereby offers an opportunity for military training to men who are unable or unwilling to join a reserve in time of peace, but who would be the first to volunteer in case of war.

HARRISON TWEED,  
103 East Eighty-sixth Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Washington:

I wish to urge that section 56 of Senate bill 4840 should be retained, for the reason that a Federal reserve is the most effective and desirable means of national defense, and for the further reason that voluntary training camps such as were held at Plattsburg should be established upon a permanent basis.

B. H. INNESS BROWN.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I desire to protest most strongly against effort to defeat Federal reserve plan, section 56, military preparedness bill.

H. S. DUELL.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Washington:

Please use your influence to secure adoption section 56 of Senate military bill. This provision can not hurt National Guard and will

create an adequate reserve at a minimum cost. Camps this year throughout United States will be paid for by citizens attending.

JOHN R. VAN HOME.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Having had opportunity of observing at first hand as present member National Guard, State of New York, hopelessness of attempting to obtain really efficient and dependable soldiery through drills held in armories one night a week during winter, supplemented only by short encampments in the field in summer, and believing that attempt to federalize militia will result in large expenditures public money without adequate return, and will, in fact, result only in creating false feeling of security, I urge upon you vital necessity of retaining in Senate bill 4840 provisions of section 56, which leave way open for creation of reserve of Federal volunteers and retention of Federal training camps.

WINTHROP W. ALDRICH,  
45 East Sixty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

As citizens who have had little, if any, military training, who believe that the national safety demands that all citizens receive thorough military training who are planning to attend the Plattsburg camps this summer at considerable inconvenience and expense, we emphatically protest against any weakening of the Federal reserve provisions of the pending defense bill unless there is provided the only adequate substitute—universal military training under exclusive Federal control.

CLARENCE F. BELL, ELDA L. KIMMEY, P. W. O'GRADY, ALLEN E. SHANNON, EDGAR F. SMITH, JOSEPH S. STULL, JR., ARTHUR R. HOLBROOK, THOMAS H. WIGGIN, FREDERICK F. GRISWOLD, CLINTON L. BOGERT, JACOB M. GRAY, CHARLES R. COCKEY, EDWARD W. THODE, C. RAYMOND HULSART.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I beg you to fight for retention section 56, Senate Army bill.  
HENRY H. CURRAN,  
Republican Leader, Board of Aldermen.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I learn that the Senate contemplates elimination from Army bill provision for Federal reserve. This is the most important provision of the bill, being in some measure a recognition of the obligation of universal military service and the beginning of a real policy of preparedness. I emphatically urge the retention of this section.

ARTHUR WM. BARBER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We understand efforts being made to defeat policy looking toward Federal training camps as outlined in section 56 in Senate bill now under consideration. We earnestly protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in this section and strongly urge the passage of same.

HORACE BOWKER,  
C. M. SHULTZ.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Save section 56, Army bill, and authorize Federal reserve plan.  
L. E. WIMAN.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington:

In my opinion section 56 of Senate bill 4840 should be retained, because a Federal reserve is the best means of national defense and because voluntary camps such as were held at Plattsburg should be officially recognized and permanently established.

CARL TAYLOR,  
24 Broad Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan in section 56 of Senate bill and emphatically urge passage of this section.  
PIRIE MACDONALD.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly urge you to give your fullest support to Federal reserve plan as embodied in section 56, Senate bill now under consideration, and to work for its passage.

Respectfully,

W. R. MAY,  
121 East Thirty-eighth Street, New York.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Trust you will use every effort to retain section 56, providing for Federal training camps. Regard this as essential to sound national system of defense.

JAMES D. WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAS. A. O'GORMAN,  
U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned citizens of the United States protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan in section 56 of the Senate bill, and emphatically urge the passage of this section.

J. P. Hogan, J. S. Langthorn, F. H. Pond, M. J. Ungrich,  
C. W. Coffin, Wm. B. Hunter, Roger W. Armstrong,  
Jas. F. Sanbern, Chas. Goodman, Robt. J. Vanepps,  
James G. Grimes, Harry R. Bouton.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will give your support to bills pending providing for continuance of Plattsburg and similar training camps; sentiment of this community strongly favors such legislation. Only five attended Plattsburg from here last year, as a result of their experiences more than 100 will go this year.

E. P. EDWARDS,  
President, Schenectady Rifle Club.

ITHACA, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request your support of measures for providing a Federal volunteer force.

R. C. CANDEE,  
G. R. PHIPPS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES O'GORMAN,  
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully and most earnestly ask your support for Federal reserve measure in section 56 of the Senate bill.

JNO. AUER.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAS. A. O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Urge most emphatically the passage of section 56 of the Senate military bill providing for Federal reserve; protest earnestly against defeat of this section.

L. QUIGLEY,  
108 West Sixty-ninth Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I understand that section 56, regarding training camps, of the Senate Army bill is in danger of being defeated, the removal of this section would devitalize the bill and the State will not sanction feeble attempts at preparedness.

H. L. MEIERHOF.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAS. A. O'GORMAN,  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

The Rochester national-defense contingent, more than 700 strong and growing, vigorously protests attempt to kill section 56 of the Senate bill, permitting Secretary of War to conduct the Federal training camps. We urge your best efforts in support of the passage of this section.

N. R. POTTER,  
Member of the Executive Committee.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

As one who went to Plattsburg last summer and who expects to go again this year, and as a member of the Veteran Corps of Artillery, I urge you to do your utmost to secure the passage of Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill.

H. F. STONE.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Plattsburg behind Chamberlain bill. Please oppose Hay bill.

J. H. MALLORRY.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Favor strongly bill authorizing the President or Secretary of War organizing Federal volunteers in peace times and conducting training camps under Federal control. Understand article 56 of Federal reserve plan bill now before Senate contemplates this. Emphatically urge passage of this section and protest strongly any attempt to defeat same.

H. S. LEVERICH,  
ROBERT PETTIGREW,  
M. M. MURPHY,  
L. E. HUTTON.

STAPLETON, N. Y., April 5.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,  
Senate Chamber, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

As a member of the business men's training camp, held at Plattsburg last summer. I wish to emphatically urge the passage of section 56 of the Senate bill now under consideration, regarding the Federal reserve plan, which I consider a most important measure in the plan for national defense.

R. C. WIGAND.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, something was said yesterday by certain of the Senators regarding an extremely offensive propaganda organized by certain citizens who are especially

interested in the National Guard. I hold a letter in my hand addressed to me and signed by H. S. Sternberger, colonel, on the letterhead of the Headquarters Division, National Guard, New York Municipal Building, New York City. I shall ask to have this letter read.

It will be noted that it lacks the phraseology of the ordinary communication from a citizen to a Senator or to any other public official. It is more in the nature of a command to eliminate the volunteer army provision from the pending bill. It is based upon a positively selfish proposition, namely, that in the opinion of the writer the adoption of that provision will be prejudicial to the National Guard. He loses sight entirely of the larger and the more patriotic aspect of the question as to what is the best thing for the country in this grave crisis.

I ask that the letter may be read by the Secretary, including the heading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS DIVISION, NATIONAL GUARD, NEW YORK,  
New York City, April 4, 1916.

From: Chief of the Quartermaster Corps.

To: Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Washington, D. C.

Subject: National Guard legislation.

1. I desire to inform you that the Hay bill as passed is satisfactory to the National Guard, and I urge particularly that sections 76 and 77 of the House bill as passed be incorporated in the Senate bill. I am opposed to section 58 of the old Chamberlain bill, which authorizes the President to organize volunteers in time of peace; this, to my mind, is detrimental to all the National Guard.

2. I wish to call to your attention the fact that I shall use my influence, not only with National Guardsmen but with all citizens whom I come in contact, toward pointing out to them that the so-called continental army scheme is impracticable and would have a bad result if passed. I urge upon you as Senator from New York State, having about 18,000 National Guardsmen in active service at present, and about three times that number who have served in the National Guard, to oppose any contemplated measure that is detrimental to the interests of the National Guard at large.

H. S. STERNBERGER, Colonel.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have not the honor of any personal acquaintance with the writer of that letter, and I suspect he does not know me. If he did, he might know that the tone of his communication was not calculated to be persuasive with me. I am not accustomed to accept dictation from any source, and in a matter of this grave character I resent any attempt at coercion from any person.

Now, Mr. President, with regard to one objection the writer of that letter makes against the provision for the volunteer army, let me make this observation. The head of the National Guard in the State of New York is Maj. Gen. O'Ryan, a man of fine character and unusual military ability. He is probably the only officer connected with the National Guard in any State in this country who has been invited to take the course in the War College in this city, and he has completed it. In the opinion of Regular Army officers he is a born soldier. I am sure that the subordinate officer who wrote the offensive note to me was not voicing the sentiment of the patriotic citizens of the State of New York who are identified with the National Guard in that State, and that this volunteer army provision will not impair the efficiency of the National Guard is shown by a letter written by Gen. O'Ryan, which I shall read. Under date of January 17, 1916, Gen. O'Ryan stated:

The question is sometimes asked whether there is any conflict of interest or of effort between the organizations of the National Guard and the training camps for college and business men. This question may not only be answered emphatically in the negative, but it may be affirmatively stated with equal emphasis that the training regiments have been of benefit to the National Guard of this State at least. A very considerable number of men of the Plattsburg training regiment have joined organizations of the New York division, some as commissioned officers and some as enlisted men.

Wholly aside from the foregoing, there is another aspect of the training camps which should not be lost sight of. There are in some localities men who desire military training, but who are so circumstanced that they can not make available for the purpose the amount of time demanded by service in the National Guard. Some of the men in this class find it possible to devote 30 days for training during the summer months. The training camps furnish the needed opportunity for men in this class. These camps are, therefore, performing a service to the Nation in respect to such men which it is not possible for the National Guard to perform.

I have no hesitation in urging upon officers of the National Guard throughout the State their fullest cooperation in support of the excellent movement represented by the training camps. In New York State facilities have been provided in some of the armories for detachments of men of the training camps who desire to continue the work begun at Plattsburg.

Mr. President, the proposed volunteer army is a development of the training system referred to in this letter of Gen. O'Ryan, and I prefer to accept the opinion of this gentleman on this question rather than the criticisms here and elsewhere of men not so well qualified to speak on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I would regard it as being extremely unfortunate if, as a result of this debate, a prejudice



should be aroused throughout the country against the officers of the National Guard in the different States. For the men who have given their time and their services substantially without compensation to the National Guard in my own State I could not say anything but a good word. Many of those gentlemen have expressed to me their opinion that section 56 would not only be to the detriment of the National Guard, but, in their opinion, would work ill instead of good to the country. In expressing that opinion I believe that they are acting, as they always have acted in military affairs, from motives of extreme patriotism. After a careful study of the subject, however, I am constrained to disagree with them; but, notwithstanding that, Mr. President, I know that they are honest in what they say and that they believe every word that they tell me, I can not now refrain from expressing my dissent from some of the expressions that have been given out in the course of this debate reflecting upon their motives in working for the elimination of this particular section.

I do not think they are right. I think, on the whole, that section 56 errs in not being strong enough; and if any amendment should be offered tending to strengthen it, I would vote for it.

I have received many telegrams favoring this section, and some in opposition to it. I hope the section will be retained, and I hope, but hardly expect, that it will be amended so as to make it stronger than it is as reported by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, if by occupying even a brief time I would materially delay action upon the pending bill and its amendments I would refrain from speaking, for I realize that, so far as influencing the vote of Senators is concerned, much of the discussion here is of no avail. My only excuse for saying anything at this time is to give an opportunity to the many people who have written me on the subject of preparedness, both for and against, to understand the reasons which will compel me to vote for reasonably adequate military protection to the United States. I am not a military expert and have felt it the part of patriotic duty to defer largely in matters of detail and efficiency to those practical military men whose high character, unquestioned ability, and expert study and experience have made them authorities on this subject. Unfortunately, these experts are not entirely agreed upon all matters affecting the question, and in such cases of disagreement I have tried consistently to weigh the arguments pro and con in order to reach the best conclusion possible.

It can not be reasonably denied by even the most optimistic pacifist that the most unusual and disturbing conditions obtain in the world and in the United States that have ever been known in our history. From the alluring dreams of commercialism, in which the specter of war never entered, the world awoke to the horrid reality of "grim-visaged war" astride the world. The change to our people was startling. The days passed and 10,000,000 men were equipped with appliances of war, the most appallingly destructive that the genius and invention of man could devise—engines the most deadly ever known to the world; poisonous gases which make fatal the very breath of life, flying machines dropping death from the clouds, submarine dragoons which fill the seas with terror. As these shocking facts became known the world gasped and civilization stood still. But gradually the news of millions slain and millions maimed for life became so common that local news and markets again held the attention, at least of the American people. Europe, drunk with human blood, became the reeling, ready market for war supplies made in the United States. During all this time, revolutions, one succeeding another without intermission, were devastating Mexico, in which were rightfully thousands of Americans and other foreigners, whose lives and properties were sacrificed under direction of bandit leaders. The relations of the United States with the European belligerents and with Mexico have been strained almost to the breaking point, and at no time has the situation been more critical than it is at present.

Great Britain has rewritten the international laws governing the rights of neutrals whenever her desire prompted, and American commerce of practically all kinds has been treated as contraband and American rights have been ignored. She has made the United States one of her most effective allies, and is offended at the even mild protests of our Government. Germany has violated the laws of warfare by sinking defenseless ships carrying American citizens, who, under the law of nations, had a legal, if not a moral, right to be upon them. She is offended at us because we have but weakly protested against Great Britain's policy of making us a party to the latter's wicked efforts to starve the women, children, and noncombatants of Germany. Russia has no existing treaty with the

United States and still cherishes resentment at our attempt a few years ago to meddle with her domestic affairs. Japan's memory still rankles with our Nation's attitude in the immigration matter and listens with ill-concealed displeasure to insults from Americans. She has not forgotten the school and land episodes in California nor her frustrated attempts to acquire Magdalena Bay, and it is possible that she feels the United States lessened the fruits of her victory in the late war with Russia. European nations hold us responsible for losses sustained by their nationals in Mexico and Mexico hates the United States with an undying hatred.

The Congress has not been permitted to know the exact situation of our foreign relations. The President and his Secretary of State probably do know. Some of the President's special envoys may know what Congress does not. But I shall not at this time nor on this bill enter into any extended criticism of the administration in its conduct of our foreign affairs. The present duty is nonpartisan, and, while I hold radical views as to the cause for much of our unpleasant national predicament, I recognize that it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us.

That our foreign affairs are critical, no thoughtful man can doubt. The things which I have mentioned and others are known. The President has issued a call for help. He has said that imminent danger threatened and that our country was insufficiently prepared to meet even the Mexican situation. He has warned the people that sparks were flying all around and that our country was in danger of a destructive conflagration. He is the head of the Army and Navy, and as such he has called upon Congress to give him an adequate Army to meet the present and prospective emergencies. It will respond now, as it always has responded, to every emergency call of the Commander in Chief. Congress and the country desire that our Republic shall be preserved against any reasonable possibility of dishonor or destruction. It has a mission for humanity which will require centuries to complete and a Congress which, through mistaken notions of economy or fear of personal political death, would fail to provide in an adequate degree insurance against national loss or destruction, would betray its trust, and become an enemy of democracy.

I feel that it is a higher duty to protect the country against the possibilities of foreign invasion than is the duty of a banker to protect his deposits against burglars or his home against fire. The banker is reasonably certain his bank will never be entered by thieves, yet he makes assurance double sure by installing a safe as nearly burglar proof as possible. Not one house in a thousand burns up, and yet he insures his home against fire. With the air full of sparks, as stated by the President, and our Nation's premises very inflammable, shall we not take out insurance?

Personally I have not worked myself into the hysteria of a great war fright, and yet I believe that the possibilities of international trouble were never so great as at present. Our government's conduct of foreign affairs has contributed to this condition. Our wealth and resources invite it. The world never saw so large a number of war-trained and seasoned soldiers at one time as are now under arms. War is now to them a profession. Its terrors have steeled their nerves and deadened their sensibilities. The greatest nations of Europe are war mad.

Russia and Japan were supposed to have been bankrupted by the recent war between them, and yet to-day, before the old wounds are healed, we find them stronger and more militant than ever. England had hardly recovered from the Boer War before she entered the present conflict. Our Revolutionary War prepared the United States to enter the struggle of 1812. Does anyone doubt that at the close of the Civil War those four-year veterans would have enlisted in a war against a foreign foe even more eagerly than they went to the front in sixty-one, and that the North and South would have united?

But I believe that preparation is especially necessary now that the President and the naval and military experts have admitted and advertised to the world our unpreparedness to cope with even weak and disrupted Mexico. We must defend the priceless heritage of democracy against reasonably possible invasion. But for the sake of peace we should show the world that we are prepared to protect our own. Such preparation will be a good investment. If we are reasonably prepared for a defensive war, we will never have one. If we are not so prepared, we may have one. It is because I love peace and hate war that I want to render my country immune to the latter by preparation. Does anyone doubt that the United States would not have been subjected to many of the insults and wrongs from Mexico and the European belligerents if we had not said "We are too proud to fight"; "We have not a sufficient Army and Navy"; "We will debate questions which

throughout our history were by our Government thought undebatable?"

The peace-loving, insult-resenting, just, and trained athletic giant is never insulted, is never attacked.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I want the United States to be in a position to lead in the world effort to make impossible another such war as that now waging. If through preparation we are practically immune to war we will have more influence at the council table of the nations than we will have if it is thought that fear and self-interest prompts our action. Better to spend a billion dollars in a program of defense, even if when it is completed our guns and armor are scrapped and our war craft are left to rot and rust at their moorings, than to lead our untrained youth to slaughter in an invited war and at a cost of many billions of dollars.

And so, Mr. President, being satisfied that it is the duty of this Congress to reorganize our Army and Navy with a view to greatly increasing their efficiency, the question with me is how and when to do it. As to how it shall be done, I have already stated that I am inclined to be governed largely in my vote by men whose training and experience fit them to advise. The time to begin is now. Indeed, we are already late in beginning. The very first business of this Congress should have been this work. Just as soon as the President saw the sparks flying, just as soon as he discovered that he was wrong when he condemned those men who said our country was without adequate defense, he should have used his great demonstrated power over Congress and urged its undivided attention to preparation. He should have speeded up the Government navy yards and private contractors who were working on ships authorized two and three years ago. This work has not been hastened, and to-day we have sixty-odd war craft that have been authorized and under construction for from one to three years. If an emergency need for a larger and more efficient Army and Navy exists, every energy of the Government and its agents should be employed to its limit of greatest efficiency. The administration has been so deliberate about this matter that I have sometimes wondered if the President really did see the dangers he so graphically described on his trip through the Middle West; and yet I feel that he is right now in urging speedy and adequate preparation. Dangers do confront us, and time may be of the very essence of our safety.

As to this particular bill, I think the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and his capable and experienced assistants on the committee have given it much study in preparation, and it seems about the least that can in good reason be done. I think that a greater increase in the Standing Army should be provided for the first two years. At the end of that period we may find that we do not need so large a further increase as we now anticipate, and the faster we fill up the reserve force with men who have had service with the colors the more efficient will be our defense. It does not seem to me that the addition of 16,000 men to our already concededly inadequate Army provided in this measure is a sufficient increase for the first year. It is probable, however, that the recruiting officers will have trouble in securing 16,000 enlistments in a year. Young men are not going to break madly away from jobs paying from \$15 to \$30 a week to join the Army at \$24 per month. It also seems to me it would have been wise to have provided for a little larger pay and more attractive inducements.

I favor the committee provision for regular reserves. I have some doubts about its being of much immediate avail, for the reason that young men may not enlist, but it is worth trying. There are thousands of patriotic men in this country who are willing to enlist in such a cause as this and under these provisions, and I think it would be better to have men who are closely connected with the colors ready at hand than to rely entirely upon the National Guard.

I am especially pleased with the provisions relating to the National Guard. That is a force already in existence. It is composed of the best young men in the States. This bill will give them an inspiration and a status which will increase their usefulness. The constitutional objections which have been urged against federalizing the State militia do not have as much weight with me as perhaps they ought to have. I realize, of course, that it is possible to conceive of a State that would not follow the discipline and training prescribed and followed by the Regular Army organization, but it is highly improbable that it would do so. Under existing statutes Regular Army officers are now drilling the State militia. If this bill becomes a law, the National Guard will have greater responsibilities, and it will, in my judgment, patriotically meet them. I have no doubt about the patriotism of the American people should our country be actually threatened with invasion by a foreign nation, but they must be convinced of the real danger. You

can not expect young men to give up their ambitions, their profitable and attractive vocations of peace, and enlist in a Regular Army when they are told on high authority that the talk of a foreign war is jingoism, that we are sufficiently prepared for any probable emergency, and that no reasonable possible danger threatens, even though a little later that same authority becomes panic-stricken and without specifications states that war is possible, that our country is unprepared, and danger is imminent. Personally I hold the opinion that we should have an effective standing army of 200,000 men with short term of service, but longer term of enlistment. We should have an efficient reserve of as many more men thoroughly trained and ready at all times to be called to the colors. My own notion is that if enlistments were made for four years with regular service in time of peace of not more than two years on full pay and then two years of service in the reserves with payment for period occupied in drill, both Regular Army and reserves could be recruited so as to remain at approximately full strength. This, with the provisions of the bill for the National Guard, would, in my judgment, prepare the country adequately for any reasonably possible emergency, and would not offend the popular objections to a large standing army and would not unduly increase the burden of taxes upon the people.

I am in hearty accord with the idea of military training in our schools and colleges. Such training should be compulsory upon every physically and mentally fit boy over 15 years of age, whether he be the son of a millionaire or of a laboring man. I favor this, not alone or largely for the possible needs of war, but for the good of the boys, and therefore for the welfare of the country. Military discipline and subjection to authority are necessary to the highest good of the citizens of a republic. Such discipline is conducive to straighter, stronger, healthier men, and subjection to properly constituted authority is one of the first lessons which the citizen should learn. Neither wealth nor station should exempt any fit man from service to his country if occasion requires it. With such training our present standing army would be abundantly sufficient. If we were so prepared, Mr. President, every nation—aye, all the nations combined—would hesitate long before engaging in a war of conquest against the United States. It would answer the charge of militarism, the complaint of political influence by the Army, and relieve the people of the great burden of cost. The people do not yet understand this plan, however, and popular sentiment seems to be against it, but in time it will be adopted. In the meanwhile it becomes my duty to vote for the best thing that is possible at this time, which is the pending amended bill.

I wish I knew how much the greed of gain has had to do with our present need of preparation. I wish I knew the real status of our foreign relations. But I do not, nor can I know. Our trouble with poverty-stricken, revolution-torn Mexico has disclosed our military weakness, and 20,000 volunteers have been asked to enlist for the purpose of entering, if need be, the sun-struck, famine-infested deserts and barrens of the alleged Republic to the south of us. The President as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy is crying danger and appealing for help. I must under these circumstances, from what real knowledge I have of the situation, believe that he has not so completely reversed himself on the question of our Nation's defenses without sufficient cause, and I prefer to vote the people's money to prevent future possible trouble, even though a knowledge of the real facts might make it unnecessary, than by inaction to make possible a greater loss from disastrous invasion and the possible destruction of thousands of my countrymen.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, there is some good in section 56; and the good that is in section 56 is the basis found in the plan or system of training camps, originating, I believe, at Plattsburg, N. Y., last year.

I do not think anyone fails to appreciate the value of these training camps, and if we could have had a plain provision in this bill—and I believe I can point out a way in which we could have one—for the development and encouragement of these camps, placing the participants in the encampments under an oath of enlistment for a term of years so that they would be subject at any time to call, it would have been a very meritorious measure.

I was much interested in the letter read by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] this morning, which I think illuminates the background from whence the telegrams come that have come here this morning. That letter, signed by Gen. John F. O'Ryan, relates not to a nebulous proposition, which some members of the committee themselves admit they do not yet understand, embodied in section 56, but it relates to the encouragement of training camps; and I believe the sentiment that is reflected here this morning in the telegrams comes from those who believe in the training camps and can not come from



a full understanding of the complexities of section 56, when the members of the committee, when asked as to the purpose to be effected by that section, are unable to state what that section means.

Mr. President, I do not believe there can be any conflict between the training camps, carried to the extent of enlistment for a term of years of the men who participate in those training camps, and the National Guard. It is a little singular that the other day we were treated here to the suggestion that the National Guard was seeking to influence legislation, when this morning we are treated to the spectacle of a deluge of telegrams designed to affect legislation in the counteraspect and along the counterlines.

If it were possible to take section 56 and convert it into a plain section, plainly stating what was meant, so that there could be no difference of opinion among the members of the committee themselves as to what it meant, it would be a wise step to take. Section 56 refers to and brings into it and makes a part of it another law. You go to that law, and you find that that law incorporates another law; and we have here the spectacle of a provision proposed to be enacted which will require the consultation of three separate, independent statutes to understand what the provision means.

Under this view of the case I am impelled, I think, to vote against the provision. If the provision prevails, we will have it for what it is worth. If it is defeated, I am satisfied that there will be a measure offered in its place that will plainly point out just what is intended, and effectuate, develop, and enlarge the training-camp plan.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PITTMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CLAPP. With pleasure.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator seems to be favorable to the idea that section 56 should be eliminated from the bill. I desire to ask the Senator what provision would be made for a reserve force if the National Guard provision should be held to offend the Constitution of the United States? In that contingency there will be, of course, no provision for a reserve.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the National Guard provision can not be held to offend the Constitution practically in this, that when there is a call to arms the National Guard, consisting, as it will, of units, will, in the main, as in the Spanish War, be ready to enlist; and once enlisted into the Federal force, it becomes subject to the Federal law.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator admits, then, that, notwithstanding this proposed legislation, so far as it affects the National Guard, in the event of war it will be entirely optional with the members of the National Guard as to whether they will leave their own States?

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Minnesota does not admit that, by any means.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, is there any doubt that the National Guard can be called into service by the President for the purpose of suppressing insurrection or repelling invasion in any part of the United States?

Mr. CLAPP. None whatever. More than that, the Supreme Court has held that repelling invasion may consist of counterinvasion, the President being the one to determine as to the expediency of that; but, as putting it beyond any pale of controversy, these men can be enlisted. The Senator from New York does not understand me. I would have the camps. I would have these men take an oath that for a given number of years, whatever term might be fixed upon, they should be subject to call to arms.

As illustrating the ambiguity, the uncertainty of section 56, if war should come with section 56 in operation, we would have an indefinite number, from our present standpoint, of men who had received the training of these camps, and who would be dispersed throughout the country. On the other hand, we would have our concrete National Guard units, companies, regiments, brigades, and, I think in two States, divisions. Now, the question is, Which would be first called upon?

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] offered an amendment plainly stating that under those circumstances the National Guard should be first called. That that is the theory of the chairman of the committee is evident from the fact that the chairman of the committee insists that with section 56 enacted as it now reads, and in connection with these other three laws that you would have to read to find out what section 56 means, the National Guard would be first called upon. Whatever doubt there may be as to the correctness of that interpretation, it is an admission that the National Guard

should first be called upon, because there is no suggestion from the chairman that the law which he claims makes that provision should be repealed.

With that admission, why should there be any doubt about it? Why not accept an amendment that will put it beyond any question? And yet, when another member of the committee was asked that question yesterday morning, he was unable to answer the question. I think he might well make that admission, for I do not believe that the provision found in the Dick bill, enacted at a time when this provision of section 56 was unthought of, would cover the men enlisted under section 56.

I have always contended, since I have been in the Senate, that a law should be plain. It is sometimes excusable that we err in judgment; it is sometimes excusable that we are unable to state plainly matters difficult of statement; but there is no excuse for not stating plainly a matter which is susceptible of plain statement, and I do not believe legislation should be enacted in this form.

I can justify voting against this section, because I am satisfied that if section 56 is stricken out there will be substituted for it a plain, practical provision for carrying on and developing training camps, and providing that those who participate in those training camps shall be sworn into the service.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. CLAPP. With pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. I have listened with interest to what the Senator says. He seems to doubt whether this section meets the views of those who have been in, or wish to go into, camps for training. If the Senator will permit me, here is a telegram from the executive committee of the Association of Training Camps that I should like to have read; but of course the Senator—

Mr. CLAPP. I have no objection to its being read. I should then want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suppose every Senator has received it, perhaps.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. If so, they can say so; but it refers directly to the question that the Senator now has under discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. WARREN. I will say that it is not a late telegram. The date will be given by the Secretary. It is not one of those that came to-day.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 4, 1916.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Military Training Camps Association of the United States, consisting of 4,200 men from all sections who have attended Federal training camps and representing also not less than 30,000 citizens who will attend this year's camps at a cost of \$2,000,000 to themselves, we earnestly protest against attempt to defeat section 56, Senate military bill. This section, without impairing National Guard, will make available for service of Nation tens of thousands who, under no circumstances can be made available under a National Guard system.

MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS ASSOCIATION  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he regards that telegram as decisive of an inquiry which was made here the other day and remains unanswered, and that is as to whether there will be headquarters established with all the paraphernalia necessary for the prompt mobilization of troops corresponding to the units which might be made up of the men who participate in these training encampments.

Mr. WARREN. I will answer the Senator. The fifty-sixth is a short section and does not go into detail, but it refers specifically to the law now on the statute books passed within the last two years providing for volunteer forces. Under that act, of course, the units are the same, or relatively the same, as in the Regular Army. The Senator will keep it in mind in reading section 56 that it leaves it with the President as to calling them out. It leaves it also with the President as to how those units shall be formed, as to some particulars, just exactly as the Hay bill has done and more or less the Chamberlain bill, so that there may be additional transportation trains and other matters that are only useful when the troops are expected to go immediately into active service. In the meantime, it would only be carried as far as to train the men in these camps up to the point where, when trains for transportation, and so forth, were made up, they would have passed over all the elementary parts and be ready to take hold of the larger matters, and would be that much ahead of the volunteers who were not enlisted until war was actually upon us and our men utterly without military knowledge.

Mr. CLAPP. In other words, the Senator has not thrown any light on the question which I asked him, if he thought the sender of that telegram had in mind—

Mr. WARREN. The sender of that telegram—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and to whom?

Mr. CLAPP. I am yielding now to the Senator from Wyoming, as he is replying to my question.

Mr. WARREN. The telegram follows the—

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that the Senator confine his interruption to an inquiry.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say that the executive committee were here in person and discussed that matter with the committee, and they stated that section 56 would meet the views of that association, and that under it they would enlist.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question about the telegram.

Mr. CLAPP. I shall have to decline, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I am not going to make a speech. I want to ask a question. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he does not have some reason to believe that the telegram which he read is one of a lot of canned telegrams emanating from a common source and in substantially the same phraseology?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I would dislike to ask that question, because I have taken the stand that we ought not to deal with any of these telegrams from that attitude. I believe in the right, and more than that, I believe it is the duty of our citizens to freely communicate their views to the Members of this body.

Mr. REED. So do I, Mr. President, and if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. CLAPP. I can not yield except for a question.

Mr. DU PONT. I wish to answer the Senator as to where the headquarters of the corps are to be established. I understand that it will be in the War Department.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, I have an answer. The headquarters of this force will be in the War Department. It has been insisted on this floor that there would be units organized and each one would have its officers and they would have somewhere a central place that they might call headquarters. On the other hand, I have gone through the various laws that this proposed law refers to, and I can find no authority for that suggestion, and the question remains practically unanswered yet as to what will be the locus of these various organizations which may be trained into units, composed of the men who attend these camps.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLAPP. For an inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. All those details are embodied in the act of the Sixty-third Congress which provides for a volunteer force. This revives it. The whole thing is there, and we do not want to repeat it.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, if that is true, this requires a little illumination.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know who can illuminate it better than the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. That act provides for details of men who are called to arms and kept under arms in units all the time until their term of service expires. I submit there is not a Senator on this floor who would admit or suggest that this bill contemplates the calling of these men to a locality as men called to arms and keeping them at that locality in the interim between these terms of camp-training experience and activity.

Again, the other question remains unanswered, and now, as throwing light on the telegram offered by the Senator from Wyoming, the training-camp organization committee that has this matter in charge contemplates that there can be 100,000 men secured at an expense of something like \$3,000,000. They never dreamed of the expense contemplated by this provision. The estimates of the Senate committee contemplate twenty-four millions the first year. The training-camp committee, on the other hand, had in mind the training-camp proposition, which is a valuable thing, giving to the citizens of this country the opportunity of military training and supplementing that with an enlistment that requires them to respond to a call to arms if made within the time of the enlistment.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that on an important matter like this, instead of being told, as we were told yesterday, to first vote the provision in and then ascertain what it means, we ought first ascertain what is proposed by the section, and

if we can agree as to the purpose thus disclosed then adopt the section, and if we can not agree then reject it. Feeling certain as I do that the Senate, in case section 56 is rejected, will make a prompt and complete provision for training camps contemplated by the letter read by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and contemplated by the telegrams that we have received here this morning, I believe it is my duty to insist, as far as I can through the activities of my vote, in requiring that section 56 be made plain and explicit. I believe under the existing condition in the Senate the only way that can be accomplished is to strike out section 56 and then put in a substitute over which there can be no discussion as to what it means.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the chairman of the committee, is not here at this moment. I feel that he was most unfortunate in a portion of his remarks yesterday where he said—I read from the RECORD:

Mr. President, if the National Guard intends to come here as a political force, as it has done—there is not any question about that.

I insist that that is a most ungenerous and unfair statement. I do not believe the National Guard have come down here as a political force or have made an effort to dominate the Senate through any political means. I do know that some members of the National Guard have been here, but I believe the National Guardsmen are prompted by a spirit and a purpose as lofty and as patriotic as that of any Senator in this body. I know many of those men and I feel that the accusation is unjust and ungenerous. Those men came here because they believed the enactment of this particular bill, and particularly with section 56 in it, would tend to disintegrate and destroy their National Guard.

I will say, as I said the other day, the National Guard is an arm of great service in this country. They are not tin soldiers nor toy soldiers. It will not do to charge that on them. They are a patriotic body of men, as brave and as patriotic as any band of men who ever carried a gun. I recall very well in my own State, and I can look back far enough and recall in the State of New York and in the State of Pennsylvania when the National Guard gave infinite service to our country, infinite service to the State, and now it illy becomes Senators to talk about National Guardsmen coming down here and pressing themselves as a body, a political force, to carry out a particular measure.

I am impressed with the fact that this bill will disintegrate and destroy the National Guard. I am as much for the welfare of the country and so are these men as can be the authors of this measure. Those men have no mean or ulterior purpose to serve. They are as patriotic as we. We all realize the necessity, and you can not find a Senator in this body who is not in favor of a bill that shall better prepare our country in the hour of need. I am with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I do not believe there is a reasonable probability of our country being attacked notwithstanding the suggestions that have been advanced by the chairman of the committee. I believe we are reasonably safe, but to make assurance doubly sure I am in favor of an Army bill which shall put us beyond question in the right line as to defenses.

I urge my friends to cease this nonsense, and to my mind this injustice and unfairness, of the intimation that because one may disagree on this bill he is conspiring at the overthrow of the country for the disintegration of our armed forces. I want all to recognize that men have the right to disagree, and that those who oppose are just as patriotic, just as honest as those who advocate the measure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I shall vote against this section. Should the section fail to be stricken out, I am frank to say that I shall vote for the bill then in its entirety, though I think it would be infinitely better if the section were out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from New Jersey has flowed on past the point where I desired to make an inquiry. He said a moment ago that section 56, if enacted into law, as I understood him, would destroy the National Guard.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I said it was the belief of the National Guard. I claim no expert knowledge in military lines.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it the Senator's belief that it will destroy the National Guard?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is my fear that it would tend to disintegrate and to destroy the National Guard.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I ask the Senator a question? I am just as anxious to preserve the National Guard as is the



Senator from New Jersey, and I would do nothing consciously that would destroy it. Will the Senator from New Jersey tell us in what way the organization of this volunteer force would destroy the National Guard?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, prefacing it with what I said, that I am not an expert military man and claim to have little knowledge of matters military, it is the belief of the gentlemen who have talked with me that it would tend to disintegrate and destroy the National Guard. I think that opinion has been quite generally acquiesced in and pretty generally understood.

I have received telegrams on one side insisting that it would destroy them, and I have received some others saying that even though it did the section had better be left in. I have received them on both sides of the question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have heard some statements to the effect that the law adviser of the Army, the Judge Advocate General, had given a written opinion, and possibly several written opinions, in relation to the proposition in both the Hay and Chamberlain bills to federalize the National Guard, to state it briefly. I received this morning a letter from a very distinguished lawyer and an ex-member of the Cabinet stating that the Judge Advocate General wrote an opinion some months ago which covered the ground in relation to that subject, and that he has recently prepared another opinion regarding the provision at present under discussion. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is in possession of those opinions or if he has seen them?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that during President Taft's administration the Adjutant General rendered an opinion holding, in substance, that the National Guard could not be so federalized as to warrant the Government in undertaking to call their services into requisition to go out of the United States. That opinion was later submitted to Attorney General Wickersham, and he concurred in that opinion. I think the Senator will find that both the opinion of Judge Advocate Gen. Crowder and Mr. Wickersham were printed either in the House hearings or in one of the documents that has been referred to during this discussion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is there not a later opinion than that, about the plan proposed in the Senator's own bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not recall one now.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think it would be exceedingly interesting for us to know what the legal adviser of the Army may say about it, and as the Senator seems to be uncertain as to whether he has the opinion or not I will ask unanimous consent that the resolution I send to the desk may be agreed to, in case we have not the opinion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think I can find it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would like to have all the opinions that have been given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 158), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to furnish to the Senate any written opinions which the Judge Advocate General of the Army may have given concerning the project contained in the so-called Hay and Chamberlain bills, to federalize the National Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I object to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection, and it will go over one day.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will state my objection if necessary. Will the Chair let me explain the objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The opinions are already in the RECORD of both committees.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, just a moment, if the Senator from Missouri will allow me. While I was on my feet I referred to the fact that the Training Camps' Association estimated the cost for 100,000 men at \$5,000,000. I had intended, as showing how closely the committee and the association understood one another, to insert at that point that the estimate of the committee for the first year would be something like \$24,000,000. I shall take the liberty of inserting that at the appropriate place in my remarks.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota a question before he sits down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CLAPP. I do.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has stated that it is estimated that the training camp, as I understand, would cost \$2,000,000 a year for 100,000 men?

Mr. CLAPP. That was their estimate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Is not the Senator from Minnesota mistaken about that estimate having been made? If that was stated, it was because it cost them of their own money about \$2,000,000 to attend the training camp. That was the way I understood it.

Mr. CLAPP. Surely; they say that 100,000 men were there—I think there were not 100,000 men there, but a hundred thousand men might be there—my recollection is that the estimate was \$3,000,000 for a hundred thousand men.

Mr. BORAH. The estimate of this committee under section 56 is about \$24,000,000.

Mr. CLAPP. The estimate of the committee for the first year is \$24,000,000; for the second year, \$31,000,000; for the third year, \$39,000,000; for the fourth year, \$47,000,000; and annually thereafter, \$27,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. How was this difference of cost made up? What constitutes the difference? What is it that costs \$32,000,000 instead of \$2,000,000?

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator from Idaho will examine section 56, he will find that that section refers again to another act, the act of April 25, 1914, which, in turn, refers to still another act, and between the three acts there is the general experience which we have in legislation—too much sail for the amount of ballast—in other words, a great top-heavy organization.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire, in answer to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], to speak of what enters into that cost of \$24,000,000. That is not the actual cost of the men. We are accumulating all the time clothing, ordnance, and other matériel. The estimate for these things was printed in the RECORD yesterday, showing for the Quartermaster and Ordnance Departments just exactly what went into that estimate of \$24,000,000 per annum. The Government is laying aside and storing ordnance and other things that are necessary for the organization.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; and for that reason I have not stated it; but it was called out by some inquiry referring to the larger figures embracing those items. I simply referred to the figures estimated for the first year. There is not any great amount of accumulation carried on the first year, but that does account for the increased cost year after year, undoubtedly, but the first year it is \$24,000,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, let me make myself understood about that. The first year included in that estimate of \$24,000,000 they have \$3,651,000 for ordnance stores and supplies; \$1,318,000, manufacture of arms; \$744,000, automatic machine rifles; armament of fortifications B, \$9,226,000; small-arms target practice, \$120,000; making \$15,059,000 of the estimate that the Senator refers to. Practically all of that goes into the reserve.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I am somewhat confused about this matter of cost, in view of the various statements that have been made. What, in the opinion of the chairman of the committee, will it cost the Government of the United States to organize and train, under section 56, a volunteer force of, say, 100,000 men per annum?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know that I could give the cost for a hundred thousand men; but if the Senator will take the estimates of cost that have been referred to, it is proposed by this voluntary system to eventually raise about 261,000 men.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What will it cost?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And those men are raised in increments of one-fourth for four years, so that the final annual cost, as contained in these estimates, is the cost of the full force at the end of the fourth year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And what is that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is \$27,609,067.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Per annum?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; assuming that the enlistments would number 261,000 and were trained for 30 days.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At any rate that sum would take care of a volunteer reserve force of 261,000 men?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir; decreasing from the fourth year, because during the first, second, and third years much of this money is expended—and that is the reason the cost is large—in the accumulation of equipment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me now ask the Senator what would be the amount of contribution upon the part of the

Government toward the training and equipping of a corresponding number of the National Guard?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Under table 11, of cost—and I will say that that has been criticized by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE]—under the estimates we have here it is \$40,873,200 annually after the fourth year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For the same number of men?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. For practically the same number.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, it would cost the Federal Government, in addition to what may be spent by the States, if I understand the matter, in the neighborhood of \$12,000,000 more per annum for the same number of troops of the National Guard than it would for this contemplated volunteer reserve force. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The difference in the annual cost amounts to a little over \$13,000,000 after the fourth year.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. What is done for the National Guard that makes it cost the Government more to maintain 260,000 of the National Guard than to maintain 260,000 of the volunteers?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Their training covers a longer period; of course that is one element of cost; but it is perfectly fair to say here, Mr. President, that, in making the estimate of the cost of the National Guard, we have estimated in that, as a part of the expense, the accumulation of the same material and supplies. The difference in pay alone is about thirteen or fourteen million dollars.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood the Senator from Oregon to say yesterday, possibly, that the training of the volunteers was substantially the same in point of time as would be the training given the National Guard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But it is condensed into a 30-day period, whilst the members of the National Guard are trained in the armories each week and spend 24 days in camp.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the volunteers must be trained 30 days every year?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. To me it is utterly inconceivable—and I know there must be a very serious mistake somewhere; not made, of course, by the Senator from Oregon—that it should be asserted that you can maintain 260,000 volunteers, with their officers, at a cost of \$24,000,000, while it costs \$45,000,000 or \$40,000,000 to aid the National Guard to maintain the same number of troops. I repeat there must be a mistake somewhere in that estimate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I can not, of course, undertake to correct the figures that have been furnished us from the different branches of the War Department. I only take the figures which they gave us; that is all the committee could do. The Senator will find them very carefully compiled throughout.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, if he will turn to the figures giving the cost of the National Guard and the cost of the volunteers, he will find that the expense of the Quartermaster Corps of the National Guard is placed at \$17,000,000, \$20,000,000, \$21,000,000, \$23,000,000, and \$24,000,000. There does not seem to be any charge on a similar scale in connection with the volunteer service, unless new equipment and the 30 days' training is considered under it. I find that items for new equipment and training are also embraced in the estimates for the National Guard. That quartermaster's charge, which seems to be very large, amounting to half of the total estimate as to the National Guard, does not seem to be found to an equal extent in the estimate given as to the cost of the volunteers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I can furnish the Senator the estimates from the quartermaster's department showing the exact figures. The difference principally lies in the estimate for the pay of the two forces.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The expense of maintaining the volunteer force is paid in the same way, for the same amount of service, as in the case of the Regulars, is it not? In other words, when a man joins the volunteer force his traveling expenses are paid going to and returning from the camp to his home. Is not that correct?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it covers both.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And he is equipped, clothed, ~~and~~, given a hat, and all that, as the Regulars are, is he not?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment. I want very briefly to discuss this avalanche of telegrams. They were presented this morning in such bulk as to appear not only to be formidable but ominous. They were presented by the chairman of the committee in one bundle and by the Senator

from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] in another. I presume they were handed to us as evidence of a spontaneous uprising on behalf of the people in favor of section 56. At the same time we have heard criticized on the floor of the Senate the National Guard because members of that organization have seen fit to write letters and send telegrams urging legislation which would preserve the National Guard from destruction.

Before I discuss these telegrams I want to say a word lest I should be misunderstood. I hold that all citizens of the United States not only have the right, but it may in some instances become their duty, to send their views to their Representatives or Senators in Congress. When one receives the views of a great number of men scattered throughout his State or the country, each really expressive of the opinion of the sender, the fact at once appeals to every man who is a fit representative of the people; but in these latter days it has become the custom for some central organization to get up a propaganda and to send out to the members of an organization or association a request to deluge Congress with letters or telegrams. Generally the sender is told what he is to say, and ordinarily I think the suggestion is accompanied with the caution, "Please do not copy this exact language." So we generally find an attempt is made to vary the language.

Mr. President, I have gone through this great bundle of telegrams which were filed here by the chairman of the committee and I undertake to say that I can impanel a jury, and let him pick the 12 men, and I can prove that 90 per cent of these telegrams emanated from one common source. I can prove it by the language of the telegrams themselves. So that, instead of representing a general opinion that is entertained throughout the country, the telegrams in fact represent the opinion of some propagandist who has a special interest in section 56, either patriotic or otherwise.

Let me give you a few illustrations. Here is a telegram from Baltimore:

As a member of the first training regiment, United States military camp—

Now, note the language which follows—

I protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56, Senate bill, and urge immediate passage of this section.

Here is one from Boston:

As a member of Plattsburg training regiment, I protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan in section 56 of Senate bill and emphatically urge passage of this section.

Of course, Boston being an intellectual center, this may have been a case of thought transmission. But here is another telegram from Boston in exactly the same language as the one I just read, and here is another one from Baltimore in exactly the same language as the first telegram I read, and here is another one from Boston in exactly the same language, and still another from Boston in the same language, and still another. Then here is a telegram from Boston that changes the language by inserting the word "vigorously," so that this gentleman "vigorously protests." And here is one from Brooklyn. Now, nobody would expect Brooklyn to be so keenly attuned to mysterious intellectual processes that it would catch this vibration that is going through the air, but the gentleman from Brooklyn caught it nearly right. He substituted the word "emphatically" for "vigorously," but otherwise he caught the Boston-Baltimore language. So I can go through the lot. This is one class and one kind of language. Then there is another class, which is typified by this telegram from Pittsfield, Mass.:

Please work to put through the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill.

And there are seven telegrams from that same town in exactly the same phraseology.

Mr. President, here are about 30 telegrams which display a somewhat bungling attempt to vary the language. They come from Philadelphia, from Cambridge, Mass., from New York City, from Auburn, N. Y., and four or five other places. They are what we might call the "strongly urge" telegrams. One of them reads:

Strongly urge passage of section 56 in Senate bill relating to Army. Do not permit its defeat.

That comes from Philadelphia; but here comes one from Cambridge:

I strongly urge passage.

Just the pronoun "I" put in, which is quite a natural thing to expect in a message from Cambridge.

But here is a gentleman from New York who uses all of the language, except he puts in the word "I emphatically urge."

And so, running through some 30 telegrams, they are as plainly from one source as though they had been written in one handwriting or upon one typewriter and one kind of paper.



Here are about 50 telegrams. They come from Boston, and they come from Princeton, and they come from Brooklyn, but principally from Boston. There are, however, some from other towns. While they vary slightly in their language, all of them have substantially this sentence:

Strongly protest against defeat of section 56 of the Senate bill, embodying Federal reserve plan.

That sentence, substantially, appears in every one of them.

And so I might go through with all the telegrams comprising the great pile filed this morning. I should by so doing weary the Senate; I content myself by remarking that it is perfectly manifest, from an examination of these telegrams, that over 90 per cent of them, if not 99 per cent of them, emanated from one common source.

I simply say what I have so that nobody will think there is any great uprising indicated by these numerous messages. The charge has been made that the National Guard, because a few letters have been written in, is engaged in a lobby. Here is the positive, absolute, physical evidence in the Senate that the organization which went into camp at Plattsburg is engaged in a most vigorous and concerted attempt to influence legislation. I do not complain of it, but I do not want to hear the cry of "wolf" any more from gentlemen who represent that particular idea.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I think the telegrams and letters that are sent to Members of Congress are either from motives of patriotism or pelf. I have no objection whatever to a member of the National Guard of my State or any other States giving me his honest opinion as to the value of the National Guard to the general plan of our Army. I do not object to anybody giving me an idea or a fact, but I do not care to hear from any one who has a pecuniary interest in the matter of legislation. I have received a telegram such as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has just read.

Now, if this great Army is to be organized I have no objection to a volunteer force at all. I have no objection to these camps in the summer time for the purpose of training men in the use of arms, and teaching them the lessons of war. I think, however, the toilers of the country can ill-afford to bear the burden of taxation incident thereto at this time. Personally, I had hoped that all of this great plan, the organization of the Army and the building of a Navy, might be postponed until after the war in Europe is over, so as to permit the American people to survey the situation and organize an Army and build a Navy to meet all the exigencies and the necessities of the future. And I think that probably would have been done but for the energetic efforts on the part of those who are largely interested in the profits derived from the manufacture of munitions of war. Manifestly this Congress is not going to take the course which I would dictate or prescribe had I the power, but on the contrary, I am afraid it is going to undertake to lay the foundation of a great system—to build a house, as it were, when the flames are leaping heavenward and the storm is raging furiously about us.

That such a structure, whose foundation is laid under such circumstances, will meet the demands of the future, if we shall do our duty as a Christian Nation and the civilized peoples of the earth shall show themselves capable of self-government, I have my serious doubts.

My especial objection to section 56 is rather local in its nature. I am opposed to the whole scheme at this time, but the peculiar bearing it has upon the affairs of Mississippi means the local question of paramount importance. I pointed out certain provisions in the section a day or two ago which vitally affect the people of the State from which I come. My purpose in calling attention to the objectionable provisions of section 56 was purely patriotic. My only desire in the matter was to serve the people of Mississippi and America. But, notwithstanding my motive, I notice in the Record that my warnings and suggestions have been made the subject of ridicule by a distinguished Member of this body.

I want to say, Mr. President, that there is no argument in epithets, no reason in ridicule; and satire in the discussion of a serious question is the refuge of the intellectual bandit.

In the consideration of this great question the calmest, most serious consideration should be given to every provision of this bill. When I said that under the terms of section 56 there might be organized in the State of Mississippi a camp to which the negroes of that State would be invited, I did not say that that would be done. God forbid that there should ever come to the White House a man so utterly regardless of the interests of the people of America as to do such a thing. But this is an age of change. Marvelous changes have taken place in recent years. Things are happening to-day that we did not dream two years ago could possibly happen. I do not know

what is going to happen in the coming years. But I do know that the race question is in the South, and that it is of overshadowing, paramount importance there.

When it is suggested that such a thing is impossible, that the laboring negroes of Mississippi could not leave their farms to go to one of these camps, I want to say in reply that in the little city of Jackson, where I live, if such a camp were organized, either in Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, or anywhere else in the South, more than a regiment would, in my judgment, go from that one little city of Jackson alone, robust, vigorous negro men, who do nothing, who toil not, neither do they spin, but rather live by the hand-outs from their women employed in the homes of the white families—and if such a proposition were made to them they would flock to it like carrion crows around a carcass. There could be a camp organized in the State of Mississippi, by advertising it for 60 days, of 25,000; and the Senators from the other sections of this Republic do not know what that means to the people of Mississippi. Oh, I am not saying this in order to generate race prejudice or to advertise our own unfortunate conditions; not at all. I would to God that conditions were different, that the peril might be removed from our midst.

It was stated upon the floor of the Senate yesterday:

Suppose a lot of darkies went into Hinds County, to a so-called Plattsburg drill, as a voluntary force of some sort, and, with arms in their hands, began to be disciplined, so that in the opinion of the white people of the State they became a source of menace to white civilization, what would happen to those volunteer darkies? Echo answers, "What?"

Of course, I know what would happen, and what I know would happen, is the very thing that I do not want to happen. No man knows the difficulties in handling the affairs of a Southern State when the two races conflict, who has not served in the capacity in which I served for four years as governor. You Senators from States where you have not that problem at all read in your newspapers nearly every morning accounts of some unfortunate crime that has been committed in South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas; and what is the result? Mobbing. What is the effect of mobbing upon those who mob? I care not what the provocation may be; I do not care what crime may lead to the mobbing; the white man who participates in it, though he does it to protect his home, to preserve the peace and purity of his wife and daughters—that man who violates the law when he takes it in his own hands suffers a moral deterioration from which he will never recover; and if that thing is persisted in very long, it will destroy the very civilization which we of the South are trying to conserve. There is no doubt about that.

Now, if, for political reasons or any other reasons, with an utter disregard of the real interests not only of the southern people but all the American people—because whatever injures the South, hurts the entire Republic—any President should order a mobilization of negro troops in Mississippi or any other Southern State, keep them there for 30 days, clothe and equip them, and then send them back with all the airs they have acquired in 30 days of drill, only one who understands the nature of the Negro and his peculiarities generally would know what would follow.

But the distinguished Senator intimated that the negroes have no money to attend the camp. Under the terms of this bill, the United States Government furnishes the money to pay for transportation and general equipment. Every negro would take it as a very delightful summer outing, and if an effort should be made to bring them to the service of the United States as a part of the Army, I apprehend it would not be the least trouble to organize as large an army as the Government would be willing to pay for.

Mr. President, I would much rather take my chances without any preparation whatever to meet a foreign foe, relying upon the individual white citizen and the patriotic spirit of the men of America to defend the flag and repel any foreign invasion, than to submit to the enactment of a law of this character, which exposes the people of the South to a peril as far-reaching as the adoption of section 56. I shall therefore vote to strike that section from the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have taken no part in this discussion, beyond asking a question occasionally, having been much more anxious to vote than to talk, feeling, as I do, that there is great urgency for the speedy passage of this bill; and I am only going to take a few minutes to-day to present my views on one or two phases of the controversy that has been raging in the Senate Chamber for a week.

I am in favor of retaining section 56 in the bill as it stands, and shall so vote. I have not heard from a single member of the National Guard of my State—and we have a very efficient National Guard in New Hampshire—either for or against the

section that is under discussion, so that I am not at all influenced by anything that comes from the National Guard in reference to this matter, an organization that I am very friendly to.

I want to say, Mr. President—and I say it in all kindness, because I am not in favor of legislation that will do harm to any section of the country—that I deprecate very much the raising of the race issue in the consideration of this bill. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] a few days ago raised that issue in very plain terms, declaring that, so far as the colored man was concerned, if he had his way he would not allow him to be a soldier of the United States but would keep him in a menial position, and the Senator from Mississippi has just repeated substantially the same thing. Of course, the Senator is entitled to that view, and every other Senator is entitled to a different view if he himself holds it. Speaking for myself, I want to express in a very few words my dissent from the position that the junior Senator from Mississippi has taken. And in this connection, so that the RECORD may be right, I want to say that the Senator whom the junior Senator from Mississippi criticized a few moments ago is not a member of the Republican Party and does not sit on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, I believe I speak for the entire Republican membership of this body when I say that we have no disposition to raise the race issue. We recognize it as a very serious problem with which another section of the country has to deal, and we are content to have it worked out as best it can be; notwithstanding we dissent from some of the methods that have been used in some of the Southern States. I say, Mr. President, I deprecate the raising of the race issue in this debate, and I have called attention to the circumstances under which it has been raised.

If I have read history aright, Mr. President, the colored man made a good soldier in the Civil War. He fought for the Union, for the Constitution, and for the flag, and he fought valiantly. If I read history aright, the colored man was a good soldier in the Spanish-American War, and he never has been given the credit that belongs to him for the work he did during that struggle. I also notice, Mr. President, that only a few days ago it was colored troopers who attacked and defeated a portion of the army of the bandit Villa; and they fought then as they have frequently fought before, bravely and valiantly. Whenever put to the test the colored soldier has acquitted himself honorably.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the time may come when the loyal colored men may be needed to protect our country from invasion and defend the liberties of our people, and I should hesitate to put myself on record as saying that those men should in an emergency of that kind be denied the privilege of fighting for their country.

The political rights of the colored man have been seriously abridged and he tamely submits to what he feels is a great injustice; but notwithstanding that, he is willing to fight for his country, and to me it is inconceivable that any man should attempt to deny him that right if he wishes to exercise it.

Mr. President, I beg of Senators not to allow their minds to be beclouded in any way by the race issue, which, in my judgment, has no proper place in this discussion. The provisions of section 56 should be considered and decided from a purely military point of view, and from no other point. Believing, as I do, that section 56 is one of the most important provisions of the bill, I shall vote against striking it out, and I trust that the motion of the Senator from Maryland may not be agreed to.

I desire simply to add a single word. It seems to me this section has been sufficiently discussed. It seems to me that we ought to be content with the time that has been spent in its discussion, and that we ought to come to a speedy vote. I appeal to Senators, whatever their views may be as to this section or as to any other provision of this important bill, that they may bring their minds to the conclusion which I have reached, and that we may not spend much more time in the discussion of a matter that is perfectly well understood by every Senator on both sides of the Chamber.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to section 56 as reported by the committee.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has just stated that this question should be approached from the standpoint of military reasons. The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has said that we should consider this question from the standpoint of the interests of the country as a whole. With both these general statements I agree.

Mr. President, preparedness must be practical, preparedness must be sane; it should be efficient, and should be economical. This particular section, section 56, in my judgment should be eliminated from the bill by the Senate and more than the equivalent provided for in other ways. I do not believe preparedness is going to gain any time by leaving section 56 in the bill. It has already been voted on in the House. It was proposed by Mr. GARDNER, of Massachusetts, as an amendment to the House bill, and received so little support that he did not even ask for a division. The Senate, however—this vote may turn out by one or two majority when it is actually taken—is quite equally divided on the question. The House of Representatives, therefore, being against it overwhelmingly and the Senate of the United States being divided, under ordinary conditions is there any prospect that section 56 can be agreed to in conference?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I think the Senator has not a right under our rules to attempt to influence the judgment of the Senate by alluding to what has happened in the House of Representatives.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the Senate must settle this question from its own view and not from the view of the House of Representatives, and that it is not a legitimate argument to attempt to influence the Senate by the action of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have said on that subject all I wished to say, at any rate, and I spoke of it simply as a practical man dealing with a practical question. I look at it from the standpoint of the military considerations which the Senator from New Hampshire just now referred to. I want preparedness, effective preparedness, and at the earliest possible time, and I do not wish to see any unnecessary delays thrown in the path of the preparation of a genuine citizen soldiery for the defense of the country.

Mr. President, is there no presumption in favor of the Constitution of the United States? If a man stands on this floor and argues in favor of the citizen soldiery mentioned in the Constitution, of the citizen soldiery approved of by Gen. Washington time and again, is he not entitled to the benefit of being in accord with the fundamental law and the greatest military leader of our country? Gen. Washington described the citizen soldiery as "the palladium of our security, the first effectual resort in case of hostility." Speaking of the militia, those were his words. No man had more trouble with unorganized and undisciplined militia than he had.

We all here are or have been members of the militia when between the age of 18 and the age of 45, as are all citizens; and yet relatively few of the citizens of this country know they are in the militia as a matter of law. Such as these unorganized, undisciplined militia are what Gen. Washington alluded to whenever he did speak in terms of condemnation of militia. Such a force is of necessity unreliable from a military standpoint, and should not be entrusted with the defense of our country and our institutions.

But an organized army, a disciplined militia, provided for under section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, is an altogether different story. I can not help thinking as we read over and talk over that section that it is one of the most remarkable expressions of wisdom in that great instrument, showing the practical ability, the theoretical knowledge of the men who made our Constitution, balancing the locality against the central government; and the balance of the Constitution is one of its greatest characteristics. It lies in the fundamental division of a government, legislative, judicial, and executive, all of those great features being features of balance for the preservation of liberty without in the least degree affecting the efficiency of the Government operating under the system. I want to discuss in a few moments the provisions of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, but pass on now to a preliminary fact that for 100 years or more of the history of this country there has been a persistent and successful organized effort to defeat the full and effective exercise of the powers of Congress over the citizen soldiery prescribed in the Constitution. Congress has largely failed to exercise its right to organize, arm, and discipline the militia during all this period. The opponents of the action recommended by President after President, from Washington almost to the present day, used the present constitutional doubts and the present military insinuations against citizen soldiers.

Practically there was a lack of money, and also, as it is alleged, the ambitions of the Regular Army personnel interfered very largely with the possibility of developing a disciplined and permanently officered citizen soldiery.



That is one of the things that I want to bring to the attention of the Senate. Take this volunteer system. It necessarily is a confused condition whenever inaugurated to protect the country in an emergency. Volunteers hastily gather. Where would the officers come from? Certainly all the leading officers would come from the established personnel of the Regular Army. When appropriations were small and when opportunities of advancing the legitimate ambitions of military men were rare, there was perhaps more excuse in such an opposition, but now when the Congress is on the verge of increasing the Regular Army to 200,000 or to 250,000, when a large part of the captains will be majors and when many of the majors will be colonels by this very increase, the time has passed when anything like military jealousy on the part of the Regular personnel should be considered for a moment or respected for a moment in dealing with this great question of militia preparedness.

Congress has been largely under the influence for a long time of some kind of prejudice with reference to the militia of this country. I have been surprised sitting here in the last few days to hear the criticism coming from the old Members of this body of the alleged inefficiency and lack of discipline of the National Guard of the country.

Mr. President, if the finest young officers leaving West Point, furnished by the Government with their education, furnished with the pay that would support them, furnished with their clothing and their outfit, were told to go out and raise an army and discipline an army and at the same time Congress told those highly educated young officers, who would not have to take the time to make a living, that it would not pay any wages to that army, what sort of an army could those young men raise and maintain?

And yet, Mr. President, though Congress has for the last 10 years or more been paying something to the militia in the way of clothing and equipment, it has provided no wages to the National Guard soldiers except the wages of 50 cents a day, I believe, for some maneuvers. All this time what has been going on? A patriotic body of men, the officers and men of the National Guard of this country, have been giving of their time and of their substance to create and maintain and keep together a body of fairly disciplined soldiers that now amounts in numbers to 134,000 men, without pay for the rank and file, all losing their time, and the officers having to make up to the National Government for the clothing or other equipment individual soldiers might lose. The captain of an ordinary infantry company in the National Guard is responsible for between \$4,000 and \$5,000 worth of property to the United States, and necessarily some of that property is lost in various ways, but he, though commanding men who receive practically no pay from the country they protect, is compelled to make good out of his own pocket all the losses that occur.

The small amount that is provided for by this bill will revolutionize that situation. The \$52.50 a year that the bill carries for the national guardsman will be a recognition, at least, and by preventing a total loss of the time devoted to the country will stimulate men to attend the periods of drill and will give a money sum against which the losses may be set-off. This pay, small as it is, will go a long way toward increasing the efficiency and discipline of the National Guard in this country.

Yet Senator after Senator who has sat in this body through years and years and who has never raised his hand to give the present proposed pay of \$52.50 a year to the National Guardsman has risen in his place in the Senate and commented on what he alleged to be their lack of discipline.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that a man who had been in this body for any length of time and concurred in failure to exercise the powers of Congress to discipline the militia would be ashamed to rise in his place and point to the unpreparedness of this country in respect to the very matter that he himself has so long neglected.

Yet, Mr. President, almost every gentleman here who has criticized what he alleges to be the lack of discipline in the National Guard attempts at the same time to excuse himself on general constitutional grounds.

But how about the Constitution in respect to paying the guard? Is there any constitutional difficulty or objection to paying the National Guard? Is there any constitutional objection to this \$52.50 a year? There is no such objection, and every man in this body knows that such a provision will operate as it is claimed it will operate. Here is an obvious improvement for possible discipline, free from constitutional doubt, and yet the critics of the National Guard have held it back throughout these years.

The Senator from New York suggested doubt as to what might happen if the courts found that any of these improving provi-

sions were unconstitutional. It will be time enough when that decision is arrived at. But why has not the National Guard been paid before? How can any man who has been here and has had the opportunity of years and who has not made a record in the struggle for the payment of the National Guard even for the small wage of \$52.50 a year, rise in his seat here and point the finger of criticism at what he alleges to be a lack of discipline? Congress has failed to organize and to arm and to discipline, and the words of the Constitution say that Congress shall provide for those things.

Mr. President, I do not know where we would look if we were looking for the men who failed to do this thing. I do not want to be invidious, but the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] yesterday, when we were discussing a question of military policy as for or against section 56, criticized us all who are opposed to section 56, as though we were opposed to the preparation of this country for a legitimate and proper defense against an invading foe.

He suggested that we were practically against preparedness. I resent that suggestion, because I believe that we who stand for the use of the National Guard, for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia of this country, as recommended by Gen. Washington, as provided in the Constitution, are the fundamental and sane friends of preparedness.

There is a great advantage, certainly at the beginning, a great money advantage, in favor of the guardsman over the volunteer. The first year's financial advantage, referring to table 12 in the report of the committee, can be found by correcting table 12, first year's estimate, by deducting \$19,000,000 from that first year's cost, a sum which has been already spent and represents accumulated material now in the hands of the National Guard of this country, and then dividing the remaining sum by 153,000 guardsmen, the number for whom the estimates are now annually made, the minimum enlisted number as provided by law. This gives us \$176 per man as the annual cost of the United States of the individual guardsman, whereas the first year's cost as given by the committee for the 56,829 men and officers of the volunteers, in its first-year column, is \$439 per man. The difference in favor of the guardsman, then, for the first year's cost is the difference between \$439 and \$176, that difference being in favor of the National Guardsman.

In addition to all that, the National Guardsman has a provision of between one and two hundred million dollars—I think I am safe in saying it is nearer two than one—of armories, military homes, where their clothing, equipment, and arms can be kept; where they can drill in bad weather, in addition to the outside drills which are provided for under this proposed law. The guardsman also has the advantage of the annual appropriations of the State; my State, for instance, appropriating \$90,000 annually for the upkeep of the Guard in addition to having provided considerable investments in armories throughout the State. In this connection it is proper to add that out of the total of some 2,200 only 40 men were absent at the last inspection of the National Guard in Maryland.

But this volunteer army, so called, this so-called continental army, is a homeless body even if it can be brought to exist. Places for it to gather and keep its equipment, to issue forth from for the various purposes of military activity, are not yet provided or even estimated for by the committee.

It is remarkable, Mr. President, with these financial advantages in favor of the National Guardsman, that the committee should have gone out of its way to bring into this law a competing and, as I think, an unnecessary force. When I use the word "competing," I do not mean a force that by proper competition will improve the other, but I mean a force that gives an opportunity for all of the ancient enemies of the citizen soldiery of this country to discriminate in favor of the highly centralized force as against the citizen soldiery so carefully provided by the Constitution.

Mr. President, the committee can not be even moderately friendly to the National Guard, because if they wanted more men they could simply have increased the numbers and added that 50,000 to the National Guard, and added it as I have just shown with great economy to the Treasury of the United States, and greater promptness and certainty for the common defense.

In this connection I want to read you a little colloquy that took place in the Committee on Military Affairs between several Senators. I will just read the colloquy without the names. A Senator—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Read the names. It is a public record.

Mr. LEE of Maryland (reading):

A SENATOR. It has always seemed to me, although I have never been able to figure it out, that limitations can be placed upon these

appropriations by the Federal Government that would compel the National Guard to yield to Federal control.

ANOTHER SENATOR. That could be done as a condition to the appropriation and the method of its use.

The FIRST SENATOR. That is what I am getting at.

The SECOND SENATOR. But would such a statute be in harmony with the provisions of the Constitution upon that subject?

The FIRST SENATOR. Suppose in making an appropriation for the National Guard, for instance, it is optional with Congress to make that or not. Suppose you make an appropriation conditioned upon the National Guard of all the States obeying the regulations adopted by the Secretary of War.

The SECOND SENATOR. The regulation would not be effective unless the States agreed to it.

A THIRD SENATOR. Would not that do away with the National Guard?

The SECOND SENATOR. It would have that effect, ultimately, and I am inclined to think that if it should have that effect it would be a good thing.

A good thing, Mr. President, to do away ultimately with the citizen soldiery of the Constitution of the United States! But the fact is that the National Guard will increase and improve, however recognized, by reason of the innate ability and patriotism of its members.

The Assistant Secretary of War, testifying before the Military Committee of the Senate, said, among other things, that 90 per cent of the men in the National Guard were there with reference to national defense, and, according to his estimate, a large per cent of the Guard might go into the Garrison volunteer system which was then being pushed.

Mr. President, I would not fear such disintegration very much did I not feel that there has been throughout the history of the long struggle for preparedness in this country a persistent prejudice in military circles against completely organizing the militia of this country; but I can not help thinking that Congress may lay the foundation for a possible failure to discipline the Organized Militia when it gives the two bodies places side by side and puts the management and possibly the destiny of the two in the hands of a personnel that may lean to the centralized force and may be adverse not only to the citizen soldiery specified in the Constitution but to all citizen soldiery.

Mr. President, I was a little surprised here this morning. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] yesterday was full of indignation, and his voice showed unusual feeling for a man of such remarkable self-command, when he denounced the national guardsmen of this country for undertaking to communicate with their representatives in the Senate on this occasion. I think the Senator from Oregon went so far as to say that, if the communicating on the part of the National Guard with this body did not stop, he was for cutting it up root and branch, financially, I presume. To-day the Senator has been reading telegrams from a few National Guardsmen who favor his view, and I want to congratulate him on the increased liberality which he has to-day shown to that estimable military force. I hope that he will always maintain that attitude and will modify his attitude of yesterday, for I believe—and I think he will so believe when he thinks it over—that all of the citizens of this country can communicate properly to us here their opinions upon public questions pending in the Senate.

The long telegram which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] sent to the desk and had read is an appropriate telegram for us to consider. It shows that the Military Training Camps Association is operating in this matter and that mistaken opinions may have been disseminated about section 56 and the effect of striking it out, all of which could very easily have been started by misinformation sent by somebody to this camp association, which is in close touch, as it says in its telegram, with 30,000 citizens, and presumably has gotten as many of those citizens to telegraph the Senate as were willing to undergo the expense.

Those 30,000 citizens, according to this telegram, are going to pay \$2,000,000 for a military educational course this summer. I want to say that I have great respect for their patriotism; I am glad that they are going to do it; but the very fact that they are able to contribute \$66 each out of their private means for this purpose, as well as the length of time that is involved, shows very clearly that they belong to a class of the wealthier citizens of the country. But why not have these summer camps and military drill as members of the National Guard? This can easily be done without section 56 and a much greater military movement secured.

Mr. President, that is the very thing in this whole section 56 to which I am opposed. I do not believe we should create a separate military citizen-soldiery system. I think that these young men who are showing so much segregated patriotism ought to be encouraged to follow the flag alongside of their brethren in a really large movement. I think it would be better for them in the long run; it would be better for the country and better for their associates if they join the National Guard as guardsmen and follow the flag of their country as the soldiers

of Switzerland do, let us say, each man on an equal footing with his neighbor. Let them live together in patriotism. They may have to die together.

This segregation into a special military force is undemocratic and undesirable, especially, Mr. President, in view of the fact that all this military training can be equally well and better done through the instrumentalities of National Guard maneuvers and encampments. There is not a particle of this training that can not be given in that way if these gentlemen want to get it, and they need not spend \$66 apiece to segregate themselves from their fellow citizens. They can get it all, and they ought to get it all, at the hands of our Military Committee and be freely and sufficiently furnished with proper instruction under United States inspector instructors. It ought to be one great movement; it ought not to be a volunteer system and a militia system, conflicting one with the other; but it ought to be one great organized militia system, all mobilized at the same time and all mobilized under similar conditions.

Mobilization, Mr. President, implies uniformity. This division of military preparedness into small subdivisions is bad military policy, creating special types here and special bodies there with different relationships to national defense. Gen. Washington struggled for uniformity, and the words that I have quoted from him are connected with a plea for uniformity.

It is essential, therefore—

Said Gen. Washington on June 8, 1783, in addressing the governors of the Colonies—

that the same system should pervade the whole; that the formation and discipline of the militia of the continent should be absolutely uniform.

Here was the great Father of his Country pleading for uniformity, pleading for equality, pleading for similar efficiency, pleading against a segregation of the military and patriotic youth of the country into smaller subdivisions and under specially formed methods of discipline. He continues:

And that the same species of arms, accouterments, and military apparatus should be introduced in every part of the United States.

Why, Mr. President, we have got that. Thank Heaven, Congress has gone that far. It has clothed the soldier with a uniform in the National Guard; it has given him a musket, and given necessary other equipment to the National Guard—artillery, and so forth—similar apparatus to that used by the Regular Army.

As calling attention to the state of mind of some of the older Senators in this body, I would particularly refer to some of the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]; and I regret that he is not now in the Chamber. Speaking of the present regulations, I presume, on April 4—page 5415 of the RECORD—he said that, in order for the National Guard to get the Federal pay under existing law, it was required that "there should be 24 drills of 1½ hours each and 5 days in camp." Was that any basis of criticism of the National Guard? Who is responsible for that small number of hours of drill? Who is any more responsible for there being only five days in camp than is the Senator from Massachusetts?

The Senator from Massachusetts may have made an effort to improve this condition—I hope he did; it would be to his credit if he had done so—but why should he ignore what this bill proposes to do much more? Why should he make a comparison under the old law with reference to the militia, for which he himself may be largely responsible, and not with what it is proposed to do under this bill or a better? If the provisions of the House bill are followed, 48 drills of an hour and a half each are provided for, which is 72 hours; 15 days in camp, at 10 hours a day, make 150 hours, or 222 hours as the minimum annual drill time for the National Guard, under the provisions of the House bill. The House gives only 15 days in maneuver camps; but the bill which the Senate committee reports would give a very much longer time for drilling in summer to the National Guard, as it provides 24 days in camp for the National Guard.

I do not believe that 24 days is practicable; I do not believe that at the rates of pay offered by this bill it will be possible for the citizen soldiery of this country, the men who have homes and families, to leave those homes and to abandon temporarily the support of their families, as in many cases they would have to do, on a soldier's pay of 50 cents a day. I believe that the provision of the House bill in that respect is more practicable than is the Senate bill, and that, if anything, the pay for the citizen soldier who is responsible in his community and responsible for the support of his family should be made somewhere nearly equal to his average earnings when at home.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming presented that telegram from the Military Training Camps Association, and it was



entitled to consideration; but I want to say right here that the officers of the National Guard and the men of the National Guard, year after year, decade after decade, have been contributing their time and their money, without compensation and in amounts compared to which this small amount of money to be expended by these gentlemen going to the camps is utterly trivial. I do not think, therefore, that it lies in the mouth of any Member of this body to criticize any member of the National Guard of this country for coming here, for being interested in preparation, for presenting his views in connection with advancing the preparation for defense, about which he has not been a mere talker, but in favor of which he has acted so honestly and so earnestly and with so much expense to himself.

Mr. President, I really believe that our Regular Army needs a little shaking up somewhere; I believe it needs a little extension of military public opinion, of the military knowledge of this country, such as would be created from increasing the numbers and improving the discipline of the National Guard, for instance. Our Regular Army is extremely slow to act in some respects. I think the Military Committee of the Senate, which has been charged with the burden of preparedness through many years, and which is as much responsible for our present condition as any other body of men in the country, ought to have the advantage of more alacrity, broader recommendations, and more genuine suggestion of preparedness from the higher officers of the Army.

In this connection it is proper to give two instances which I think throw a little light on this situation—personal experiences of my own. In May, 1914, I introduced a resolution. I had been thinking over the military situation and the situation in Mexico. It occurred to me that if we went into Mexico—a possibility which did come about very recently—that water and transportation would be the things the troops would especially need. I introduced a resolution on that subject, and it was sent to the Committee on Military Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, requested to prepare and bring in a bill for defining the duty and conferring the power and means upon some part of the Supply Corps of the United States Army to enlist the necessary men of proper mechanical skill and to acquire the necessary pipe, tools, pumping engines, well-boring machinery, auto trucks, and other transportation for promptly securing and distributing water supplies for drinking and washing purposes to United States troops in time of war or when war may be considered possible; and that the object of said bill should be to authorize all necessary details of officers from the Engineer Corps and Medical Corps and to use all available mechanical means in the hands of a disciplined and efficient service to create and keep a good water supply as near to the front as conditions render possible, and for which purpose the present contract system for Army water supply is obviously inadequate; and that the said general purpose of said bill may be connected, if feasible, with increased facilities for the distribution of ammunition and food and water to advanced forces.

What became of that resolution? I presume it slumbers to-day on the files of the Military Committee; but, it has been stated in the papers—and with apparent truth—that when this movement into Mexico took place the other day the Army was without water tanks to send along with the men, and that the Standard Oil Co., out of its abundant means, had permitted our little Army to have six automobile water tanks which the Standard Oil Co. was just then providing for its purposes. This special subject had been called to the attention of the Military Committee, and possibly by them to the supply corps of the United States Army, in May, 1914, and yet the United States Army, moving a few thousand men into Mexico, has to accept automobile water tanks from the Standard Oil Co.!

Mr. President, there is another little incident to which I desire to refer. I happened to be in the Military Committee one day when an officer was testifying. I never saw him before, but he would make an impression upon any observer as being a man of force and an officer of unusual attainments. After the members of the committee were through questioning him the chairman, with great courtesy, permitted me to ask him a couple of questions, and I asked him about the contest that is now going on along the whole European front between guns of fixed position and guns of concealed position. The great military struggle in Europe to-day is being determined in large part by this contest between the concealed great guns of position, for the fixed positions are abandoned. Col. Glenn, in answer to that question, filed a brochure dealing with the question of guns of concealed position, which is a part of the testimony taken by the Military Committee of the Senate. In that brochure he showed the very great utility of great movable and hidden guns; for the struggle now is between the eyesight of the flying forces and the skill of the men who handle the big guns. The big guns are concealed in every sort of position. They are placed under houses, placed behind hills, placed in little pieces of timber, placed wherever they can be concealed from the spying eye of the flying forces of the adversary. On either hand there is a

tunnel leading from the gun to a dugout, and the artillerists handling a gun, whenever the enemy find where that gun is and commence to shell it, disappear like prairie dogs in these two side tunnels, and after the bombardment is over they come out and take what is left of their gun at night and put it in a new place.

That is the process going on in this war with reference to great guns. Col. Glenn testified that the great guns of fixed position in the fortress of Verdun had been removed by the French and hidden behind the fortress in concealed positions. I state this to prepare you for the letter I am about to read; and I hope the chairman of the Military Committee will not leave the Chamber, because I think this is a significant little circumstance that surely ought not to miss his attention. Here we are, 16 months after Liege and Namur, where great concrete and steel fortresses were destroyed by shell fire of the guns of concealed position, and here is a letter written by Gen. H. L. Scott, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in which he describes the position of our Army in that respect to-day:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,  
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. DICK: I am very sorry not to have seen you when you were here. To-day is the first time I have been out since then. I took up the subject of the mobile guns of large caliber a year ago and have been agitating it ever since, with the result that we have got the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary on our side, and we have estimates in for six, to begin with. After we once get the carriage design approved we can get more. I believe they are very necessary on both coasts and intend to do all I can to get mobile guns of large caliber with carriage on trucks and railway carriages.

Regretting I have not had the opportunity of seeing you, I am,

Ever sincerely, yours,

H. L. SCOTT.

MR. EVANS R. DICK,  
30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Dick had been discussing with me the question of movable guns of position, and this letter was so descriptive of the general condition of our defenselessness that he sent it to me in connection with our previous conversation.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for Gen. Scott; he is a brave old soldier, and I am glad that he is making this fight for these six guns; but what a pitiful picture this letter presents! We have no coast defenses, Mr. President. We have some harbor defenses—and great movable guns are needed for the defense of our country generally. There ought to be 600 such guns; and yet we have not a carriage designed and in condition to be approved, and after we get a carriage approved the General thinks he can get some more. Why, Mr. President, with this nakedness of ours from a military standpoint clearly apparent, what is this strange hypnotic control that some influences are exercising over the preparedness of this country? They are the very same influences, I believe, that when we come here striving for uniformity in the citizen soldiery of the United States oppose provision for the National Guardsmen, who can be furnished so much more cheaply than the volunteers and in so much greater numbers for the protection of the country. The whole thing has elements of mystery. The average Regular soldier costs \$1,150 a year; the average citizen soldier in the National Guard, as I have shown, costs \$170 a year. With all the pay and equipment that this bill proposes to give them, with all the increased power of discipline it proposes to give over them, five or six national guardsmen can be provided for the same cost of one soldier in the Regular Army, and in the first year two guardsmen can be furnished for the cost of one volunteer.

Mr. President, it has been testified by all the military experts that the defense of this country is no small thing; that anything less than a possible force of one or two million men is comparative defenselessness. Where are you going to get one or two million men for genuine defense? The only possible way is by the more economical method of disciplining the citizen soldier, the man who supports himself at home, the man who is not segregated from the productive activities of the Nation.

I desire now to discuss for a little while the constitutional objections which have been submitted here, especially by the able Senator from Idaho [MR. BORAH]. It is obvious that that Senator has strong feelings against the National Guard. I do not believe, however, that his feelings would affect his conclusions as a lawyer. They certainly do affect his figures when he speaks about the National Guard. I was struck the other day while he was talking that every time he mentioned the expenditure for the National Guard under this proposed legislation he added \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 to the round numbers, with a certain soaring of arithmetical enthusiasm that showed a feeling of condemnation on the inside.

MR. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With great pleasure.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator if it is not true, notwithstanding I soared occasionally on the question of figures, that I always kept below the estimates which are given by the House committee for the expense of the National Guard under its plan, and below the estimates given by the Senate committee for the expense of the National Guard under its plan?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I was so far away from the distinguished Senator that I could only see that he was soaring. I really do not recall the exact figures he used. I could see that he had not made any deduction whatever for the corrections that I had worked out and applied to the estimates of the committee. I could see that he had not taken in that mere little bagatelle of an error which the committee brought in here of \$19,000,000 for the first year's cost of the National Guard.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With great pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator believe the committee made an error of \$19,000,000?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is my impression. I am not yielding the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to answer that, but I do not care to occupy the floor against the Senator's wishes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator deal with it while I am on my feet; but the Vice President has taken the position that I would lose the floor—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Wyoming to ask if it were not true that a certain report showed certain figures different from what the Senator had been asserting.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator puts a different construction upon the figures, and I was going to correct it, if he would allow me to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is at liberty to yield at his pleasure the first time. He does not forfeit the floor until he has yielded the second time. The Senator is at liberty to yield to the Senator from Wyoming or anybody else the first time, for any sort of discussion he sees proper to engage in.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I should be glad to have the Senator suggest the correction while I am on my feet.

Mr. WARREN. The \$19,000,000 that the Senator speaks of to be deducted, was the cost of the equipment that is with the National Guard. Under section 56, providing for the enlistment of volunteers, there is an amount charged up there for the same kind of equipment, or a similar equipment, that amounts to nearly the whole sum.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That has got to be spent for the first year.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; of course it is money spent; but to go further, and say that the average per man is more, is not correct.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I simply take the position, Mr. President, that when the committee comes in with an estimate for the National Guard of the first-year cost, and includes in it the expenditures that have been made through 10 years past, it is not a proper first-year estimate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question, in order that I may be right?—because I do not desire to misrepresent.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. What does the Senator estimate to be the cost of the National Guard per annum after the third year?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have made no examination after the first year. I simply dealt with the first year, and I was kept pretty busy keeping up with the apparent errors of the committee for the first year. I have not had time to go into the estimates of the committee for the second and third and fourth years; but when, by correspondence with and visits to the department, I found a variation of \$19,000,000, it became necessary to attend to some other business, and I really did not have the time to inquire how much of this old material has been charged over and over again in these columns, if any. I presume, however, that the cost was carried along; because if you can put into a first-year estimate for the year 1917 expenditures made for material for 5 or 10 years back, then there is no reason why you should not put in with equal equity for the year 1918 the expenditures for 1917 and sundry years behind that.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] attacked the militia on the theory that they had usurped the powers of courts. I could

not help thinking, as he spoke, how much easier it would be for local courts and local sentiment in a State to correct any military usurpation by local soldiery than it would be to correct a national soldiery guilty of the same form of usurpation; and undoubtedly military power always will be guilty of usurpation in dealing with the affairs of citizens under martial or semi-martial conditions.

On one day the Senator from Idaho argued that the power of appointment by the States of local officers would give large local influence over the militia; and he quoted from Mr. Hamilton, the Federalist, No. 29, to the effect that the power of appointing officers would always secure a local influence in connection with the militia forces of the State.

Mr. President, I think that is a most excellent effect. I think that in a republic there should be some local sympathy, some local knowledge, some local connection in the mind and the political conscience of the officer. I think that is perhaps the fundamental reason why Gen. Washington and the framers of the Constitution provided, in this remarkable part of section 8, for that excellent balance in dealing with the militia between the States and the Nation as represented by Congress.

There are in that section only two powers reserved to the States—the appointment of the officers and the authority of training. Those two powers are reserved to the States, but that reservation is subject to an absolute control, because the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia has to be “according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.”

Mr. HARDWICK. Not the appointment of the officers.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly, both; and why separate them? How could the constitutional mind of Washington, the practical mind of Washington, consider the training of troops separately from the selection of the officers? They go together.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he will put in the RECORD, in connection with his remarks, the language of the Constitution on which he bases that remarkable contention.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will with great pleasure. I have just quoted it—

Reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

There is not an intimation that the discipline does not apply to the selection of the officer, as well as to the training that the officer is to give. Remarkable? Why, it is the inevitable meaning of plain language.

Let us turn to the dictionary.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, there is a comma after the words “appointment of the officers,” is there not? Is it not a complete sentence?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No; there is no comma after the word “officers” in the copy I have.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is in the Constitution.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not think, Mr. President, that the comma would deprive Congress of its jurisdiction, even if it should be found to be there. I am inclined to think that this serious question of providing a discipline for the militia, and for the qualifications of the officers who apply that discipline, is something that the Constitution intended Congress to have the power to control.

The word “prescribe,” Mr. President, is no mild word. It means “to set or lay down authoritatively for direction or control; to give as a law or direction; to lay down laws or rules; to give directions”; and one of the synonyms is “dictate.”

The word “discipline” is a strong word, Mr. President. It means “systematic training or subjection to authority; especially, the training of the mental, moral, and physical powers by instruction and exercise, and by authoritative control and direction; a course of exercise and practice in order to bring and keep under control, and to qualify for harmonious and effective action; the state of being subject to rule, or under control or command; systematic obedience; subjection; as, ‘his men are under perfect discipline’; a system of rules or method of practice.”

With these extensive powers reserved to the Congress of the United States, it is a singular thing that throughout more than 100 years of our history these powers have practically lain dormant; and only in the last 10 or 12 years, stung, perhaps, by the pitiable and miserable losses of the Spanish War, the horrible sicknesses that came from a lack of preparation, has there been some slight effort by Congress to exercise its extensive powers over the citizen soldiery of this country.

This is, indeed, a remarkable provision. It carries with it a perfect balance between the State and the Nation. It parallels the balance in all the rest of the Constitution; and it is



by reason of this provision, which, I believe, expresses the best thought of the best period of our Nation's life that I would prefer to see a harmonious militia, well disciplined, well armed, well organized, provided for and carried on by the Federal power granted to Congress under this section, and why I would prefer that that remnant of local sympathy which section 8 of article 1 would leave in the local soldiery should be left there for the protection of this great country from internal revolution.

Mr. President, in arming a great Nation we must arm it to repel attacks from within as well as attacks from without. We are arming to-day because we are convinced, as the chairman of the committee has wisely said, that man is a predatory animal, and that characteristic applies to men within national boundaries just as well as it does to men outside of national boundaries; and it especially applies to us, who are composed of all the nations that make up the peoples of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate and the attention of the gentlemen who stick in the bark on the power of Congress to organize, arm, and discipline the militia, to how natural and consistent it is to organizing and disciplining the militia that the words "according to the discipline prescribed by Congress," the last words in this particular clause of section 8, article 1, apply back to both the appointment of officers and the authority of training, because the appointment of the officer and the training that the officer gives are essentially the same function. The selection of the agent and the action of the agent are naturally contemplated in one mental process. To say that Congress can control, by prescribing a discipline, the action of the agents—the training—but is cut off, by a comma, from applying a discipline to appointing the agents—the officers—is to argue for an unreasonable incongruity. I mean, of course, the providing, as to officers, for certain general characteristics which a discipline, a rule of conduct, a law laid down, could provide—that these officers, from whom the authority of the State could make the appointment, must have qualified in some general way showing their ability to be officers.

Now, Mr. President, very briefly, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the corresponding language of the Swiss constitution in Article 21. It will be found in full on page 9 of Senate Document 360:

The composition of these bodies of troops, the maintenance of their effective strength, the appointment and promotion of their officers, shall belong to the Cantons, subject to general regulations which shall be issued to them by the Confederation.

In Switzerland, under the general military law of 1907, which I have included in Senate Document No. 360, that works out in this way: The great body of the troops of Switzerland are Cantonal troops. There are 22 Cantons in Switzerland. The country is divided as to races also. Two-thirds of the Swiss are German and the remaining third are French and Italian. All of their public documents are printed in the three languages. They have had to combine the 22 separate States or Cantons and three separate races into one effective Confederation for military purposes, and they have accomplished that combination and have presented to the world the spectacle of a perfect army composed of a citizen soldiery.

Why, Mr. President, for some years I used to be troubled by this continual slurring of the militia of this country, and I had gotten into my nature a little of the distrust of the ultimate possibilities that could be brought about by a citizen soldiery as a line of defense for our country. I had heard so much of this that I have made a study of Switzerland's military law and of her constitution as bearing on this question, and of the result of that law as expressed by the army that defends that country to-day. I have had considerable difficulty in getting some of this testimony. From about page 45 to page 70 of that document, the testimony bearing upon the efficiency of the Swiss Army is entirely new. It embraces the report of our present military attaché for Switzerland, Capt. Exton, of the United States Army.

The authorities of the War College refused to let me have that report, basing the refusal upon the order of the Secretary of War, Mr. Garrison. I did not argue the question with the general who refused to permit the copying of this document because I have respect for him. I believed him to be a good officer and that he properly construed his orders from Secretary of War Garrison as he understood them. But in view of the fact that Switzerland was a neutral country, in view of the fact that all the spies of all the world are there or could be there, it seemed to me perfectly obvious that there was no impropriety in publishing Capt. Exton's report.

But, as I say, I did not argue the question with our military authorities, but applied, through the State Department, to the Swiss military authorities for their permission to publish this

report, and in that connection received from them a brief statement showing the number of men mobilized in Switzerland and the time of that mobilization, and afterward secured an order from the present Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, for this evidence.

I wish to read into the Record what Capt. Exton, of the Artillery—now stationed in Switzerland, at Berne—says about the Swiss soldier:

The soldier: The appearance and work of the soldier during the few days of mobilization showed him to have so benefited by his previous training in service as to make the Swiss Army probably the best-trained army, for its size, in the world to-day.

Every man seemed thoroughly familiar with his duty, which he performed more or less as a matter of business.

The discipline appeared excellent and of the character that is cheerfully accepted rather than maintained by force. The relation between officers and men was quite intimate at times, yet there was at the same time such an observance of details as might be found only in the German Army.

As a matter of fact, everything about the Swiss Army, especially their thoroughness as to details, seems modeled after the German Army.

The officers: An officer of the line should never be judged, except after some considerable service either in campaign or at maneuvers—yet from the work observed during mobilization and from conversations with Swiss officers during the past three months it is believed that the Swiss officers will, especially since their service during the past year, compare favorably with the officers of any army in the world.

It must be remembered that the Swiss officers are selected from the educated men of Switzerland, and among them are found the leading men of every profession and business; and when one considers that in order to have reached the grade of second lieutenant he must have spent at least 336 days at intensive military training, 144 days of which is principally school work, one realizes the seriousness with which the service is accepted and the standard of thoroughness which may be attained in such a militia system.

Mr. PRESIDENT, I want to emphasize the fact that this is a militia system—this best-disciplined army of its size to-day in Europe.

If any Member of the Senate has any doubt as to what could be accomplished by the National Guard of the United States by Congress prescribing a discipline and by organizing an army and disciplining the militia, let him read this pamphlet and see what the Swiss have done for their army.

It is said, in extenuation of the failure of Congress to act, that Switzerland is a small country and that the mobilization which has been so effective, and which is made there every summer is relatively easy. Why, Mr. President, we can mobilize 200,000 men in sections every summer and mobilize our entire Guard and Federal Army every summer in as small a section as Switzerland covers if necessary. Compared with the resources of Switzerland, our resources are unlimited.

In this connection, and in conclusion, I want to read into the Record the language of Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, from *McCulloch* against Maryland, page 420, in which that great Chief Justice lays down the limitations of the implied powers of Congress. Why, Mr. President, if there were nothing in this section 8 except the words "organizing, arming, and disciplining," the implied powers would give Congress the necessary control of the details of that organization, arming, and disciplining; and the exceptions to the States from that large authority given Congress over the militia—the appointment of the officers and the authority to train—expressly limited and, as just now shown, are subject to the discipline prescribed by Congress. I maintain that under the powers of Congress this body has the right to see to it that the officer has the character and capacity, and that the officer with the capacity is the one appointed by the local authorities, and that the officer when appointed shall train the militia according to the discipline. The whole express power would be useless without the implied power to cause a discharge of an officer and to see to it by inspection that the officer acts according to the discipline.

With that suggestion I include the following language from *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. U. S. Sup. Ct., 420):

We admit, as all must admit, that the powers of the Government are limited, and that its limits are not to be transcended. But we think the sound construction of the Constitution must allow to the National Legislature that discretion, with respect to the means by which the powers it confers are to be carried into execution, which will enable that body to perform the high duties assigned to it in the manner most beneficial to the people. Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Catron	Clapp	Culberson
Brandegee	Chamberlain	Clark, Wyo.	Cummins
Burleigh	Chilton	Clarke, Ark.	Curtis



du Pont  
Gallinger  
Harding  
Hardwick  
Hitchcock  
Hughes  
Husting  
Johnson, Me.  
Johnson, S. D.  
Jones  
Kenyon

Lane  
Lee, Md.  
Lewis  
Lippitt  
Lodge  
McCumber  
Martin, Va.  
Nelson  
Norris  
O'Connor  
Oliver

Overman  
Page  
Phelan  
Pittman  
Poindexter  
Pomeroy  
Robinson  
Saulsbury  
Shafroth  
Sheppard  
Smith, Md.

Smith, S. C.  
Smoot  
Swanson  
Thomas  
Vardaman  
Warren  
Weeks  
Williams

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the adoption of the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] for section 56.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, just a word in explanation of the difference between section 56 and the substitute offered.

Section 56 is weak in that it does not start with any organized unit and there is no incentive to induce men to go somewhere to meet some one else from somewhere whom they have never met for the sole purpose of being drilled for four weeks.

The substitute lays hold of an organization of a military character already created, and everywhere throughout the country, whose very existence springs from the military instinct—an organization which would earnestly welcome this opportunity for greater perfection of drill and greater knowledge of military tactics.

Section 56 depends for its success upon the individual impulse of the citizen without support and without that animation which organized numbers alone can evoke.

The substitute utilizes the enthusiasm of youth which has already found expression in organization and directs it into the realm of accomplishment and national usefulness.

Section 56, in my judgment, will not bear the fruitage expected by its authors. A 30-day enlistment and drill each year at your own expense, which binds you to give your services at a time you may believe they are not needed, or they can with less hardship be performed by others whose situation is more favorable, is not a very great inducement to enroll under this section. The difficulty in securing an enlistment of 20,000 men, recently authorized, might well open our eyes to the reality of this condition.

The substitute, because it is giving just the opportunity which these students wish, will, in my judgment, result in more offers than the Government could accept.

Section 56, if it could be made a success at all, would give an army of about 260,000 at the utmost.

The substitute would give an army of at least 750,000 to begin with, and as each student would be subject to call in case of war up to the age of 45 years, would in a very few years give us an auxiliary army of millions.

Section 56 provides for a training of 30 days annually, certainly a very meager training for a soldier.

The substitute would require training one day each week for 9 or 10 months, as is the present rule, and this in addition to the camp life and camp training of at least two months on the larger scale.

Section 56 contemplates the training of those who are outside or beyond the student age. It would draw men from their business and occupations.

The substitute operates during the student life in association with it, supplementing the mental with physical exercises, assisting in developing both the mental and physical, and without any loss or waste of time.

Section 56, as already suggested in this debate, would give us at least a quasi aristocratic organization of gentlemen—a sort of exclusive military club.

This substitute draws the youth from every rank of life, develops and intensifies the sentiment of brotherhood and equality, and sends them back into the avenues of civil life, thereby preventing the military spirit from becoming the dominant or controlling sentiment of those who are thus prepared for war.

Mr. President, I noticed in introducing the amendment I inadvertently omitted three words, and I will ask to correct the amendment before it is voted on. On page 2, line 7, after the words "high school," I wish to insert "academy and college."

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I raise a question of order as to whether the motion of the Senator from North Dakota, which is a motion to strike out and insert, takes precedence over the motion of the Senator from Maryland, which is a motion simply to strike out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rule provides that one shall not prejudice the other. It is not a motion in the third degree. The Chair looks at the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to insert the matter proposed by him in lieu of section 56 as the pending question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does that take precedence of simply a motion to strike out?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in the nature of a perfecting motion. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Maryland to strike out section 56.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to record my protest against the tone of much of the argument that has been made in favor of section 56. There is running through substantially all that has been said in behalf of this section the thought, if not the expression, that those of us who believe that it ought to be expunged from the bill are not patriotic; that we are opposed to adequate military preparedness. I do not suggest that those who are for the section are less patriotic than I am; I do not suggest that they are less sincere or earnest in their desire to prepare this country against any danger that may beset her than I am; and I appeal, as a matter of fairness, against the intolerance which betrays itself in the suggestion that those of us who believe that the National Guard as an organized reserve in the country is better than the combination of the volunteer reserve and the guard reserve are wanting in our duty at the present moment.

I am just as sincerely in favor of preparedness—adequate, reasonable, efficient preparedness—as is the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator in this body. I am opposed to the section and to the force it proposes because I feel—it seems to me that I know—that in the operation of the section or the organization of the volunteer reserve army and the National Guard both will become inefficient; that the one will not be created and the other will be disintegrated.

As I said once before in discussing this section, it is impossible to believe that when peace comes—and I assume we do not intend to be constantly in war—the Congress of the United States will not appropriate \$100,000,000 each year for the purpose of maintaining an organized reserve. The whole history of the country leads to no other conclusion than the one I have just stated, and we are face to face with these alternatives, in my opinion. We must either take the Guard, strengthen it as we can or as we see fit, or we must take the volunteer army and create it, with such equipment and such organization as it ought to have. It is unwise and impolitic to do both, for in the struggle that will constantly be maintained between them we will treat both meagerly, inadequately, and neither will ever constitute the reserve toward which we are looking.

I have no prejudice against the volunteer army. If Congress desires to depend upon it rather than upon the National Guard, I will not protest, and I will be willing to give it all the aid that it needs in order to become a strong, dependable force. I believe that the guard is the better force. It is already organized. It already has the confidence of the young men upon whom we must depend in the various States. We can maintain it, we can perpetuate it, with vastly less expenditure of money than will be required if we endeavor to raise a volunteer army to a similar strength and a similar state of efficiency. We are here about to authorize a regular army of 180,000 men, with the authority on the part of the President in time of war to raise it to 250,000 men. I do not assert—

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CUMMINS. In just a moment. I do not assert that the army proposed is too large. I do not believe it is too large, although I will have a comment to make in a moment with regard to the system we are employing with respect to the Regular Army. I yield now to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I would like to ask the Senator just one question. Is there any reason why discipline and maneuvering, such as that furnished at Plattsburg, could not be furnished to the National Guard somewhere?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is furnished in the National Guard. There was no facility for training presented at Plattsburg that is not presented in every field meeting of a well-organized guard, and I know—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, because I have seen the guard in operation, and I know something of its fidelity to the instructions that are imposed upon it by officers of the Regular Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.



Mr. HARDWICK. I merely want to suggest to the Senator that the question of summer camps is not directly nor necessarily associated with this volunteer army at all, and section 52 of the House bill provides adequately for summer camps, although the volunteer or continental army was discarded by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CUMMINS. I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia. I will now yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I simply wanted to ask the Senator why he thought there would be any deadly competition between this volunteer force and the National Guard. It seems to me that it would be emulation rather than competition, and that providing for the one furnishes no reason in the world for not providing for the other. If the National Guard needs anything at all it needs a healthy emulation. The Senator has just said that the National Guard might have maneuvers, but they meet only five days in the year, and the Senator must assuredly be apprised of the fact that they can hardly master skirmish drill during those five days, even if they served three years, which would make 15 days. Assuredly the Senator must know that there is nothing that could take place in connection with the force provided for under section 56 which would either cripple or kill or vigorously compete against the National Guard. He must know that the men who will attend the so-called Plattsburg drills under section 56 are men who, under no circumstances, would enlist in the National Guard. Now, why not leave us both instead of merely one?

Mr. CUMMINS. Simply because I—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Iowa that the interruption of the Senator from Mississippi was not a question; it was a speech. If the Senator yields again he loses his right to the floor under the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg pardon. I did not hear what the Chair said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair said the interruption of the Senator from Mississippi was not a question; it was debate in the most positive terms.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With all due deference to the Chair, it was a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair differs with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was nothing in it except a question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will be guided by the judgment of the Chair in that respect, and I will endeavor to conclude what I have to say without incurring the hazard of losing the floor.

My reply to the Senator from Mississippi, because, however elaborate the statement, it was really a question, is this. Congress will not maintain both. I do not mean to say that Congress would not authorize such a camp as we had at Plattsburg or at Fort Sheridan. The mere provision for such a camp is not the scope of this section. It is true that these exhibitions of military enthusiasm furnish illustrations to those speaking for section 56 of its need or necessity, but section 56 has no relation at all to temporary camps of the character to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred. In section 56 we are giving the President the power, without any real restriction, to raise an Army of 261,000 men, to arm them, to equip them, to command them. They are brought into the service for the purpose of training. They are required to enlist in the Army of the United States, and if that enlistment be in the same terms as now required of enlisted men in the Regular Army they will be required to obligate themselves to serve for seven years in the Army for such length of time as the President may think best in training only, but with the power on the part of the President to order them at any moment, when war or threatened war seems before us, into the actual service for the purpose of fighting the battles of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield now, Mr. President, for a question, and a question only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For a question only.

Mr. CUMMINS. And I rely upon the Chair to protect me in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator must be the judge of his own rights.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A question that will elicit information and not convey argument or antagonize or support the argument.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi will see that I must yield only for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very sorry that question should have been raised. I asked the Senator to yield to me for a question. I did not ask anything more.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not make any difference for what purpose the Senator yields; if he is going to permit the Senator from Mississippi to make a speech, his time is exhausted. The Senator from Mississippi can make a speech if he wants.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Considering the fact that the Chair and the Senator from Iowa both seem to be suspicious of my motive, I will not even ask the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I beg to assure the Senator from Mississippi that I am not suspicious of his motive. I was compelled under the circumstances in order to retain the floor to say that I yielded for a question, and I shall regret it very much if—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I will ask the question.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question is this. Will the Senator tell me why there should be a question of competition rather than merely a question of emulation between the National Guard and this volunteer force?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will endeavor to make—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that that is nothing but an argument, and the Senator must take the chance of the Senator who interrogates him as to whether or not he will confine himself to the rule. In the judgment of the Chair the Senator from Iowa has forfeited the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to continue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For what length of time does the Senator desire to proceed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, against the ruling of the Chair just pronounced I respectfully take an appeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because even under the ruling of the Chair I have done nothing except to ask a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the appeal.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the appeal I ask that the Reporter read precisely what the Senator from Mississippi said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that is proper, and the Reporter will read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that my language be read to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that it be done in order to prove that it was nothing but a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done. The ruling is that the question must be such as to elicit information about a question of fact, not in the nature of an argument, it makes no difference whether it is long or short.

The Reporter read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I will ask the question.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question is this: Will the Senator tell me why there should be a question of competition rather than merely a question of emulation between the National Guard and this volunteer force?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon the ruling of the Chair I take an appeal to the Senate upon the ground that even upon the Chair's ruling a Senator has a right to ask another Senator a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If it is a question to elicit information, the Chair agrees with the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are called for.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the rule is to be of any value at all, it must be uniformly enforced and uniformly respected. The Chair has not any power to enlarge it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the question is taken I should like to know, for information, what we are to vote on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is whether or not a question which conveys or calls for argument is a question for information.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit it is not that; that it is whether the question submitted by the Senator from Mississippi is a question which is allowable under the rule that has been established by somebody, I do not know by whom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. ASHURST, who voted in the affirmative, and the names of Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. BECKHAM.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I should like to have the form of the proposition we are to vote upon stated by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know exactly what the question is. There is so much confusion in the Chamber that I have been unable to understand it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair made a ruling that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] had asked a question which conveyed an argument. The Senator from Mississippi appeals from the ruling of the Chair; and the question is, Shall the opinion of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll call has started.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order while the roll is being called. The roll call will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In the absence of that Senator I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. He being absent, and I not knowing how he would vote on this question if he were present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. As I understand it, the Senator from Missouri and I are going to exchange those pairs, so that I may transfer my pair to my colleague and the Senator from Missouri may transfer his pair to the Senator from Florida. I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], who is unavoidably absent, and I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I should like to inquire if the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a pair with that Senator, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the negative). I have voted notwithstanding my pair, but I am very much in doubt whether or not I should do so. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. DU PONT (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with that Senator, and not knowing how he would vote if present I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]; and

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. BURLEIGH. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. In his absence I withhold my vote, and will let this announcement stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 33, as follows:

#### YEAS—24.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Shafroth	Taggart
Bankhead	Lewis	Sheppard	Thomas
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Phelan	Smith, Ga.	Underwood
Culberson	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.	Vardaman
Gore	Robinson	Swanson	Walsh

#### NAYS—33.

Brandegee	Husting	Norris	Sterling
Broussard	Jones	Oliver	Sutherland
Cañon	Kenyon	Overman	Townsend
Clapp	Lane	Page	Warren
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Williams
Curtis	Lippitt	Poindexter	Works
Dillingham	Lodge	Pomerene	
Gallinger	McCumber	Reed	
Harding	Nelson	Smoot	

#### NOT VOTING—39.

Beckham	Fletcher	La Follette	Shields
Borah	Goff	Lea, Tenn.	Simmons
Brady	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Chilton	Hughes	Newlands	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	James	O'Gorman	Tillman
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Wadsworth
du Pont	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Weeks
Fall	Kern	Saulsbury	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the appeal of the Senator from Mississippi, the yeas are 24 and the nays are 33. So the decision of the Chair does not stand as the judgment of the Senate. The Chair construes the action of the Senate without any possible personal feeling in the matter. The only desire of the Chair was to enforce what he understood to be the rule. Now that the Senate has deliberately established another rule, the Chair will just as loyally enforce that one, if he can. So we go back to the old practice of allowing the Senator on the floor to be the judge as to whether or not he shall be interrupted, by whom, and for what purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is not any longer necessary.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have, however, the privilege of limiting the purpose for which I shall yield, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize that the Senator from Iowa can not yield for anything except a question under the rules. I do not ask him to yield at all; but, after the Senator is through, I intend to make a few comments upon the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may do as he is advised.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I make no comment upon the ruling of the Chair, for there has been so much uncertainty with reference to this particular matter that it is not strange that there is difference of opinion about it; but I will proceed at once to answer the question propounded to me by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Senator from Mississippi asks why it is that there need be any conflict between the National Guard and the Volunteer Army to be organized under section 56? There is no conflict in the sense in which the Senator from Mississippi uses the word; there is no feeling between them, or I hope there would be no feeling between the men who would volunteer under section 56 and the men who volunteer in the National Guard. It is not because I think there would be any rancor or any contest between these two bodies of men that I oppose section 56. I oppose it because, as I have said many times, it simply strikes down our entire efficient organized force; and I marvel that anybody who favors preparedness in any degree can see his way clear to the creation of the volunteer force.

Why, Mr. President, we have authorized here a Regular Army of 180,000 men. The Regular Army is our principal defense; and now we propose not to have reserves, as they are ordinarily understood, but to create organized reserves in companies, regiments, brigades, divisions, corps, to the extent of more than 500,000 men, assuming that the National Guard is enlisted to its full strength and that the Volunteer Army is enlisted to its full strength.

Mr. President, do you believe that the people of the United States in times of peace will sustain, at an annual expense of \$100,000,000 or more, two organized bodies of reserves, with their companies, regiments, and divisions, all ready to move into the field actively, together with a Regular Army of 180,000 men? No. The disproportion is absurd; it is sustained by no experience in the world.



Mark you, I am not now speaking of the vast number of unorganized trained young men who will be called upon to volunteer in the event of war; I am speaking of three great armies: One constantly in the service, called the Regular Army; one intermittently in the service, called the Volunteer Army; and the third, intermittently in the service, called the National Guard. We ought not to delude ourselves with any such pretense as necessarily grows out of the situation I have just described.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question, not under the rule, but because I do not want to be interrupted for anything but a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that there is any rule on the subject; but the Senator may limit his concession to his colleague to suit himself.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not a fact that every nation in the world which has a reserve has a reserve which is three or four times as large as its standing army?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, that brings me to a very interesting point in this discussion. I had intended to deal with it at a later time, but, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska, I might just as well express my opinion upon it now.

The whole plan of preparation represented in the bill now before us is utterly inadequate. No nation in all time was ever prepared for war under the volunteer system. I want that to sink into the consciousness of the Senator from Nebraska. A nation can not prepare itself for war under a volunteer system. Volunteers will fight a war—and our main reliance, if we are ever so unfortunate as to be engaged in war with a great nation, will be upon volunteers—but we can not prepare so that we are instantly ready to carry on a conflict of that kind through the volunteer system.

The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon have challenged those of us who favor the elimination of section 56 to a "show-down." I am here to accept that challenge; I am here to say that if we ever are prepared for war, if we change the policy which has been maintained throughout the whole life of the Republic and reach the conclusion that we ought to be really prepared at an instant's notice for a great conflict, then we must abandon this theory, this traditional volunteer regular army.

Why should the Senator from Nebraska or why should the Senator from Iowa expect one of his fellow men to fight for him at \$15 a month and board? It is absurd. If we ask the citizens of the United States to organize themselves in sufficient numbers to constitute a regular army which will be adequate against any attack that may be precipitated against us, then we must have compulsory service. Why should the Regular Army not be made up of all our citizens? I do not mean at the same time, and I am not now speaking of the number which should constitute the Regular Army; but assuming, as this bill has assumed, that we need a Regular Army of 250,000 men, and in time of peace of 180,000, why do you ask men to enroll themselves in it at \$15 a month and board? Why should not the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Iowa, if we are not both over age, take our chances and bear the burdens of citizenship in a country like this? Why should we not constitute a part of the Regular Army, if in the chances of conscription the lot should fall upon us?

I venture to say that the Regular Army provided for in this bill—and I was really glad to hear the Senator from Oregon yesterday grant its inadequacies in this respect—I venture to say that the Regular Army provided for in the bill will never be enlisted to the extent of 180,000 men, unless we engage in war. When war comes, when the peril is upon us, then there is a patriotism that springs to the country's need, and supplies the lack of attractiveness that we now see in the enlisted ranks. Who will work for \$15 a month under command of officers who feel, and necessarily feel, all the authority vested in them?

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] himself read only a day or two ago—and he was supplemented by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] a little later—that, notwithstanding all the efforts that the Government was able to put forth to enlist men under the authority recently granted to the President, we had not yet, according to the Senator from Oregon, enlisted 2,500 men, and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that we are in some peril on account of the situation in Mexico, a peril that might well stimulate and energize the patriotism of all the people of this country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will not the Senator now answer my question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have in substance answered the Senator's question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I asked the Senator from Iowa to name a single country in the world that maintains a regular army that does not maintain a reserve several times as large as the army, and the Senator has not answered the question.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no other country in the world that has any such system as is here proposed unless some parallel could be drawn between this plan and that followed by Great Britain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me ask the Senator another question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will not enter into an argument with the Senator from Nebraska, for I am answering his question. The suggestion I have just made answers the question of the Senator from Nebraska. Every country that declares as its policy complete preparedness for war has every citizen of military age in its reserve. It is not a question of willingness or unwillingness to serve as a supplementary body; it is a part of the policy of the military nations to lay these burdens upon all their boys and all their men until they pass the military age, and they are all parts of one great army which we in this country would call the Regular Army. I want, therefore, the Senators who are so enthusiastic for preparedness to come, if they desire, and meet that real issue. If it is to be insisted that this Nation shall always be ready to engage any other nation in the world upon a moment's notice in war, then the volunteer system proposed by this bill is a shadow hardly a beginning in the process of reforming or changing or transforming the policy which has for more than 100 years been observed among the American people.

I want to put an end now, for all time, if I can, to this constant reproach in all the big newspapers of the land that anyone who has the temerity to question the wisdom of anything that is proposed in this bill is an enemy of his country and opposed to proper preparedness. I resent that charge. I understand perfectly that no Senator who has discussed the bill has directly questioned the motives of any Senator who intends to vote for the elimination of section 56; but I repeat that in every utterance there is against those who favor its elimination an offensive tone. We who believe that the National Guard should constitute the organized reserve of the country, and believe that any attempt to divide the contribution or the support given by the General Government to the organized reserves will but weaken them both and render both incapable of performing the services expected of them, are just as devoted to the Union, just as attached to its honor, and just as determined to defend its integrity as those who believe—honestly believe, I have no doubt—that we ought to create these two bodies of organized reserves.

I do not represent the National Guard any more than I represent the Regular Army or the volunteer army that might be organized under this bill. I have just as much devotion to the one as to the other. No man can exceed me in his admiration for the courage and the efficiency of the officers of the Regular Army of the United States, and no man surpass me in his appreciation of the devotion and the steadiness of the enlisted men.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator contend that there is no country which maintains a reserve several times larger than its standing army, except in the case of involuntary service?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know of any.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I will tell the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator will speak in his own time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator about Great Britain, then?

Mr. CUMMINS. I made an exception of Great Britain. The Senator heard me make the exception.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator about Spain and Sweden, then?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not examined the military laws of Spain and Sweden, but I can not allow the Senator to inject the legislation of those countries in my remarks. I would not care if Sweden and Spain do maintain such a reserve; it would not affect my judgment of American human nature or my opinion with respect to the best course that the Congress of the United States ought to pursue. When I come to examine those laws, I have no doubt that I will find that they agree in substance with the statement I have made.

Mr. President, it is not for me to defend the National Guard against some of the insinuations and aspersions which have been cast upon the members of that military body—I mean the aspersions growing out of their interest in the legislation and out of the telegrams which they have sent to certain Members of this body. I would be the last man to excuse the tone of the letter read this morning at the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I agree that it was offensive;

but are we to condemn 120,000 of the best boys in the country—not better, of course, than their brothers in the same community, but boys with whom I, at least, am proud to associate; boys who understand their duty to their country, and are proud to perform it—are we to impeach them and overthrow their reputation because an ill-considered letter was written by one officer of the Guard to a Member of this body?

The injustice of holding, or trying to hold, or suggesting that we hold, all the members of the Guard responsible for an intemperate, injudicious act committed by one of them must be so apparent that I need not further enlarge upon it.

I know that the members of the National Guard—while I do not speak for them; I have no authority to speak for them—are simply attempting to do what they believe best for their country. They have no other motive save the motive which actuates all of us to do the thing which will promote the strength and the dignity and the safety of the United States. If they are mistaken with regard to the effect which this section will have upon their organization, it is a mistake in which, without any influence whatsoever from them, I share, because I believe that these two bodies of organized reserves will not be maintained by the United States. It is uneconomical; it is unmilitary; it is indefensible from my point of view, and we ought not to enter upon that experiment. I repeat that if the Senate honestly believes that the Volunteer Army will constitute a better source, a more reliable and dependable source of strength if we fall into the misfortune of war, then we ought to bend all our energies to the creation of a body of reserves in that way. My contention is that we are defeating the very object we are trying to attain when we endeavor to create and maintain these two distinct bodies in our military force.

Mr. President, if I believed that the National Guard had any sinister design upon the liberties of our country; if I could see, in the efforts that have been made to promote their organization, any desire to infringe upon the rights of citizens; if I could see, in all that they do, anything but a deep, profound desire to render service to their country, and service of the exact kind this bill contemplates, I would not feel so earnestly about it. But being sure of their patriotism, and being sure of their persistent energy, and being sure, if we give to them whatever aid we can and federalize them so far as we can, that when the moment comes when we need military strength we can get in that way more of it and of a better quality than we could possibly get in the way proposed by the committee. I am doing what I can to maintain them as a permanent body, simply because I believe that if they are made to understand that their future depends upon the maintenance of these two independent bodies all spirit will be driven out of them, and we will have delivered a fatal blow to their growth and their efficiency.

Allow me to say to the Senator from Mississippi that if this section provided only for such experiments as were conducted over the country last year in the way of camps to which men who had no opportunity to ally themselves with the Guard could resort, I would have no objection whatever to it; but these camps are not the things provided for in this section. If we want to give the men who spend their vacations in this way an opportunity to do it under more favorable circumstances, I will join in any legislation which has that for its object. But that is not the object of the section. The purpose of the section is to enlist an army of 260,000 reserves—organized reserves. The object of the militia portions of the bill, or the Guard portions of the bill, is to enlist a body of reserves of the same number; and I am impelled to the conclusion that the effort to maintain them both will prove a disastrous failure.

Mr. HARDWICK and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi indicated that he desired to address the Chair. If the Senator from Georgia will excuse the Chair, he will recognize the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise merely for the purpose of explaining the recent appeal from the decision of the Chair, the grounds upon which it was based, and the result which alone can legitimately follow from it; and in that connection it becomes absolutely necessary to say something about the obiter dictum involved in the decision of the Chair.

After the Senate had ruled on my appeal the Chair announced that the Chair would go back to the old practice. Now, that was not the object of the appeal; that was not the result of the appeal; and that ought not to be the effect of the appeal. I am talking now in order to straighten out future rulings of the Chair.

I am just as much opposed as anybody is to a Senator upon the floor farming out the floor to other Senators under the guise of asking questions in order that other Senators may

make speeches; nor was that principle to the slightest degree involved in the appeal, except by the obiter dictum of the Chair, and it was purely obiter dictum at that. I am opposed to that because it is dilatory, because it is objectionable in every possible way, and because the past rulings of the Presidents and Presidents pro tempore of the Senate have pronounced it objectionable and dilatory.

Mr. President, the question between you and the Senate, or between you and me which was decided by the Senate, was this: Was my interjection into the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] a question or was it an argument? That is all. All that the Chair was called upon to decide was whether it was a question or an argument. The Chair decided that it was an argument. Now it becomes necessary to state just what occurred.

I rose and asked the Senator from Iowa if he would yield to a question. He yielded to a question. Even if after that I had put something to him that was not a question, the Senator from Iowa would not have been responsible for it and could not in justice have been held responsible for it. He could have interrupted me the moment I transcended the limits, and could have said to me, "That is not a question; it is an argument." Or the Chair could have interrupted me and could have said, "The Senator from Iowa has yielded for a question, and the Senator from Mississippi is making a speech or an argument," and then the Chair would have been exactly right. But I asked the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for a question, and the Senator from Iowa yielded to me for a question, and yielded for no other purpose; and in taking the appeal from the decision of the Chair I was not taking it to protect myself, I was taking it to protect the Senator from Iowa.

When the Senator yielded for a question, I propounded this question: "Why does the Senator from Iowa contend that these two clauses relating to the volunteer force and the National Guard constitute a competition rather than an emulation?"

Now, I may be stupid; I may be almost idiotic, and at times I think most of us are; but if I could frame a question at all, that would be an interrogation. I framed it in that way because, just a moment before that, the Chair had given me an intimation, upon a previous so-called question, that I must not argue; and if the Chair had made the ruling upon the previous question the Chair would have been right. But the Chair did not make it there. The Chair made it upon the last question, which was nothing in the world but a question.

Now, the Chair knows me and I know the Chair, and we both know that there could not be any question of personal antagonism that anybody in the world could raise between us two. I do think, however, that when the Chair went out of his way, after the Senate had decided the question against the Chair and in favor of my appeal, to say that hereafter we will go back to the old practice—and the old practice admitted of infinite farming out of the floor by one Senator to another—the Chair was pronouncing purely an obiter dictum which the Chair had no right to pronounce. The Chair had no right to say that the effect of the vote of the Senate upon that appeal was to say that hereafter any Senator may farm out the floor for any sort of an interruption, because what the Senate really did decide was this, and this only—that my interruption was an interrogative interruption, and not an argumentative interruption.

The Senate decided that I was right in that contention and that the Chair was wrong in that contention, and that is all that the Senate decided; and I decline to let the Chair make out of that appeal, and out of its successful maintenance by the Senate, the contention that hereafter any occupant of the Chair—he or anybody else—will be justified in ruling that one Senator has a right to interrupt another for the purpose of making a speech or an argument, rather than merely for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. President, it may be said that a man may ask a question for information or he may ask a question in order to puncture an argument; but provided it be a question and a mere interrogation, the ultimate motive of the question does not apply. I may ask some Senator, who is talking about the negro question, where he lives. That may involve an argument, because if he lives where there are no negroes he may give me one answer, and if he lives where there is a majority of them he may give me another. It might be said that the question involved an argument, but not in the question. It would involve, perhaps, an argument in the answer, but not in the question itself.

I rose, Mr. President, merely to say that the decision of the Senate meant only what the Senate decided, not what the Chair, by obiter dictum, put into it by remarks which were totally uncalled for.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The last remark of the Senator from Mississippi would justify more being said than I intend to say.

Under the rule there is no more right to ask a question than to interrupt a Senator in any other form; but it has been worked into the rule as an implied exception growing out of the necessity for it. It occasionally happens that it is necessary to know more definitely a certain state of facts in order to apply intelligently the argument that is being made. Custom, therefore, has introduced a limitation on the rule that permits a Senator to yield for a question, and all the rulings that have been heretofore made on that subject have recognized that implied exception.

The Chair believed, in view of the growing business of the country and the length of the sessions of Congress, that the Senate was prepared to enforce, with more strict respect to its spirit and meaning, the rule which allowed a Senator to address the Senate but twice on the same day on the same question; and that these continued interruptions, notwithstanding they are not only had by the consent of the Senator having the floor but are frequently actually invited by the Senator speaking—it gives him a new topic to discuss, which is not at all times offensive—were to be discouraged in every proper way. If there were none to be considered except the Senator addressing the Senate and the Senator who desired to interrupt, there would be little complaint about the old practice; but it is evident to some of us now that it has the effect of extending the sessions, diverting the discussions, and almost invariably depleting the Senate Chamber. It therefore occurred to me that the rule might be enforced according to its real spirit and intent in really limiting each Senator to the right to address the Senate twice only on the same question and on the same day.

Under this condition, unless the Chair is somewhat largely the judge of the character of the question that implies an argument, or invites an argument, or punctures an argument, the rule has no value at all. Of course, he could arbitrarily apply it if disposed to do it; but I do not think I have made that reputation here. At least I have not done so wittingly. No self-respecting officer will make a ruling that is subject on every occasion to be censured according to the color and bias of the personal and political surroundings at the time.

I had no objection to the Senator from Mississippi appealing from the decision of the Chair. On the contrary, I invited it, because I wanted the judgment of the Senate to settle the limits of the rule, once and for all. This is the Senate. It makes its own rules. It supervises those who enforce them; and the way in which it wants them enforced is the way in which they should be enforced.

The matter has been disposed of. I shall not hereafter undertake to guess what is a question and what is not a question within the sense of the rule. I have tried to define it as an inquiry that would elicit information about a matter of fact. If it involves an answer to an argument, or if it suggests an argument, or if it punctures an argument, as the Senator from Mississippi says, I thought it was argumentative in character, and I therefore took that view of it. The Senate has decided in the particular case that the rule as the Chair understood was not to be enforced; and as there is no standard by which the Chair can determine in the future what a question is, he therefore shall decline to guess about it. The Senate must, on objection from the floor, hereafter be the judge of that matter itself.

The Chair invited the appeal. The Chair is entirely satisfied to have it settled. The Chair is not mad with anybody about the action taken. The Chair did not say anything that he supposed was uncalled for, otherwise he would not have said it; and he is sure the Senator from Mississippi will not care to adhere to that observation when he thinks about the matter a little further.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, there have been so many arguments made with reference to this question that are not justified by the facts, and there are so many misapprehensions both here and in the country about the real meaning of this section, that I feel that before we vote, those of us who favor the elimination of this section ought to call attention to certain inconsistencies in the arguments and positions of the proponents of this proposition.

In the first place, you would think from the telegrams individual Senators are receiving about this matter that the real thing involved in section 56 was these summer training camps like the one at Plattsburg, and people throughout this Republic are appealing to Senators not to do away with the summer training camps. Why, Mr. President, the proposition involved in section 56 is neither directly nor necessarily associated with these training camps in the remotest degree whatever.

In the Hay bill, for instance, where the continental-army plan was rejected—a proposition, by the way, which the House of Representatives defeated by an overwhelming majority—provision was made in section 82 for these summer training camps, and there is no reason on earth why we can not have camps like those at Plattsburg and Fort Oglethorpe throughout the country without necessarily having to have either a volunteer or a continental army. So much for that phase of the question.

One argument made was that the Senate ought to provide for this volunteer force, because business men who did not have time to attend the militia drills could go into this system, and would do so, and yet the argument was made by these same gentlemen, the proponents of this bill, that the militia were so inefficient, drilled so little, and were so poorly trained that we ought to have this more efficient volunteer force instead of the militia. They blow hot one minute and cold the other, and we can not confine them to either side of anything connected with this question. They insist on having both sides of the whole business.

If the volunteer force proposed by section 56 is going to provide a well-disciplined, thoroughly trained, efficient military reserve force for the United States, it is going to take time, and lots of time, from these business men; and the very business men to whom the proponents of this measure said this system appeals, who have not time to go into an "inefficient" militia, will never have time to embrace any of its benefits. On the other hand, Mr. President, if the fact is that this system is to establish a nice, gilded, summer-resort proposition for weary business men of affairs who like to hie themselves away to the mountains or to the seacoast when the heated periods come—if it is going to do that, and if it is going to give to those men, I say, a nice summer vacation, and they are going to divert themselves by a little patriotic training in these summer camps, and it is to be no more than that—then I ask these distinguished gentlemen how much more efficient will this volunteer force be than our militia?

It seems to me that they impale themselves on one or the other horn of this dilemma.

Mr. President, in the course of his very eloquent and very forceful remarks on yesterday, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], invoking as he did the patriotic spirit of this country to come to the assistance of his beleaguered bill and to save his threatened section, said one thing that was true absolutely beyond all question, and that is, I think, the keynote of this entire situation. He spoke not only with eloquence but with historical accuracy when he said, "The boys of this country have fought every war that it has ever had." That is the truth; and yet when I propose to establish these reserves, not in a summer man's frolicking camp, not even in the militia, as far as the real backbone of the reserves goes, but in the schools and colleges of this country, where 2,000,000 boys are who can and will gladly furnish all the reserve forces that this country need, I can get no support from this honorable committee. I say they are wedded to ideas, that they want to do something that pride of opinion has committed them to, or they would not neglect this school question.

Just one other observation, and I shall have concluded what I want to say on this section, because I do think we ought to come to as speedily a vote as is possible.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] yesterday appealed—almost on his knees, metaphorically—to Members of this body, and especially to Members on this side, to stand by the committee and follow the committee. Senators, I have had somewhat of a long service, for a man of my years, here in Congress, in one House or the other; and I fully agree with the Senator from Nebraska that ordinarily you ought to follow the recommendations of your committees, especially in the other House of Congress, where, I am willing to say, measuring my words, that committee work is much more efficient and painstaking than it is in this House of Congress. But it seems to me that that rule is subject to several qualifications that no fair-minded or experienced legislator can well dispute.

If it is a question of information—something that the committee has had the opportunity to study out, something that the committee has had the time and the opportunity and the means to know about better than other Members of the body who are not on the committee—then, of course, we ought to follow the committee, because they have superior information on the question at issue, and have had the opportunity and the time, and have taken both, to familiarize themselves with the question. But, on the other hand, Senators, if the question at issue is one of principle, if it is merely whether we are going to apply to a proposition one governmental principle or another,

then I think any Senator in this body is just as capable of forming his own opinion, expressing and voicing and voting his own conviction, as any member of any committee that this body ever appointed or constituted.

So much, Mr. President, for the issues involved in the motion to strike out section 56. We will never get a real reserve for this country unless we do one of two things. The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] mentioned one of them yesterday—compulsory military service—and I want to say to him and to a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who voiced the same sentiment to-day it is utterly repugnant to my democratic instincts, aye, to my American instincts, to hear such a sentiment expressed here and such a course suggested. I do not believe in compulsory military training. It is un-American, and I hope and pray the time may never come when we shall have to resort to it in this country.

The happy geographical isolation of the American Republic has long saved our people so far from the burdens of this character that European nations have had to bear. I do not believe the situation has so changed or that the time has yet come when we must depart from one of the best of American principles and say to our people they must bear the burden of general and compulsory military service. Even in England, Mr. President, the other great Anglo-Saxon country of this world, although that country is engaged in a colossal struggle in which her very life is at stake, the idea of general compulsory service among all her people is not generally popular. The instincts of our people are peaceable. They are democrats—and I use the word broadly, not in a partisan sense—in their tastes, peaceful in their instincts, and we do not want to set up any military establishment in this country like that which the taxpayers of Europe have groaned under for years. It is not necessary. There is nothing in the situation here or elsewhere that suggests any such necessity. If we are not going to do that, and I hope the time will never come when stern national necessity will require it, and I do not believe it is at hand now, or anywhere in sight—if we are not going to do that, the only way we can get an adequate reserve for the Army is in connection with the schools, where the boys will be glad to have training and where they can have it at the smallest possible expense under any plan, without the slightest disturbance to business or industry in any form. That is what we ought to do, and if we want to have a real reserve it is what we will do before we get through with the debate and pass this bill.

Therefore I am utterly unwilling to take any such hollow plan as section 56, which is urged on the one hand because the business men want to go off on a frolic and can not spare time enough to drill in the National Guard, and is urged on the other hand because it will provide a more efficient force than the militia. The utter inconsistency of the two positions shows how hard put are the proponents of this section for argument to support it with, and strengthens my conviction that it will accomplish nothing of practical importance, and had best be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am not going to attempt to speak. I rose merely to suggest that I hope the Senate will vote on this question now, and to say that because of the slow progress which has been made on the bill, after to-day I am going to request the Senate to hold evening sessions so that the bill may be disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, respecting the request made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] just now, I shall occupy but a few moments. I have not yet said a word upon this bill, although I am deeply interested in it. I believe in national preparedness, and I have so believed for many years. I believe that we are totally unprepared to-day to defend ourselves against any invasion of any first-class power. I have been receiving telegrams both for and against section 56. I received one this morning which I desire to read from a man whom I honor and respect. I have confidence in his judgment and wisdom as a citizen and as a soldier. He served his country in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War. He gave a splendid account of himself and won laurels for the State from which he enlisted. This telegram is dated April 5, Salt Lake City, Utah, and reads as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, April 5, 1916.

Hon. REED SMOOT,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is my opinion that section 56, Senate bill, if enacted into law will force complete disorganization National Guard. If this force is destroyed don't believe a force of its present efficiency and numbers can be created by any scheme of citizen soldiery within 10 years.

E. A. WEDGWOOD,  
Adjutant General.

Mr. President, if I believed what that telegram states, and I want to be frank in saying that I know the man who sent it believes it with all his heart, I would vote to strike out section 56. But I feel that he is too apprehensive of the result of such action. I believe, Mr. President, that if section 56 is retained in the bill it will in no way affect the future usefulness and effectiveness of our National Guard.

I know that our National Guard is composed of a splendid set of men. I know if this country was in trouble they would be among the foremost and best defenders of it. I know they are loyal and true Americans. I want the National Guard recognized to as great an extent as this bill provides for, and if I had my way it would be greater. I also believe that there should be a volunteer army, and while the one provided for in section 56 is not as I would wish, I shall vote for it. The expense of such an army has been referred to by many Senators, and it should be considered; but I believe with a first-class volunteer army peace will be easier maintained, and to secure this we should not hesitate at expending the amount that is provided for in the bill, and even a greater amount if necessary.

I believe that unpreparedness is the road to war. I am also fearful, Mr. President, that the National Guard can not be federalized, but will not discuss that question, as it has been so well covered by others. I have such faith in our National Guard I believe, that even if such was the case, all would respond and do their full duty if trouble came.

I shall content myself by saying that I shall vote to retain section 56.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I find myself in a position that I frequently occupy in this body. The debate has continued to such an extent that I fear to trespass upon the time of the Senate. It has continued for days and weeks, and we have heard arguments made over and over again. I have been ready to vote on this question at any time in the past week or 10 days. But so much turmoil has been created in various States, and in my State, that when I am called on to vote at this stage of the proceedings I think it is due to myself to state the reasons for the position which I propose to take.

I do not find anything in the pending proposition particularly pleasing to me. An attempt is being made to do something for the National Guard. A little sop, which will cost the people of the United States something like \$24,000,000, has been thrown to them, with no possible chance, in my belief, of enhancing in the slightest degree the efficiency of the National Guard. Something like \$24,000,000 is being thrown to the Volunteer Reserve Corps. It may do them a considerable amount of good, but in my humble judgment it is not going to result in the slightest degree to the advantage of the American people, unless there is something in the argument that a people like ourselves can be satisfied by a great expenditure of money, and that, being in a hysterical condition, the spectacle of Congress spending one hundred and odd million dollars will serve as a sort of sedative to their nerves and they will go through this period of public excitement with more comfort than they would otherwise have.

There may be something in what we are doing from that point of view, but it does seem to me it is a great pity in an emergency of this kind, when the people of the United States are actually aroused, that we can not keep ourselves free of the red tape, the cobwebs, the manacles, the ankle irons that traditions have forced upon us in the past when we were simply playing at having an army.

Now, the people are convinced that the recent events which have occurred in the world are of such a character that nations are likely to go to war against each other on slight pretense and for any or no reason. A great many people believe we have lived for years in a fool's paradise, when we believed that nations could not be gotten to go to war. No man would have been rash enough to predict that the situation which now exists in Europe could possibly take place, but here it is. It has a reflex effect upon the people of the United States, and they are crying out in their blind way for an army with which to defend them, and here we are talking about a volunteer reserve force, we are talking about a National Guard which we have ourselves made inefficient, and no one talks about the only thing that can be of any possible service to us in a time of emergency, to wit, the Regular Establishment of this country. It is admitted in these debates that we can not even enlist the Regular force up to the present authorized strength, and no one wants to do anything about that. There has been no suggestion made along those lines.

I want to state what I think this situation calls for. I realize the impossibility of coming in here on the floor of the Senate and attempting to recast a great military bill, but how pathetic it is to see it being dealt with in the old way—a little more



money, a few more men, this expenditure here, and that expenditure there, and after all it seems to me nothing absolutely is accomplished to bring about the result the American people want and for which the American people will be compelled to pay.

If I had my way the least I would do would be to raise the standing Army to 250,000 men. We can not get 100,000 now. Then, if we want 250,000 men what will common sense dictate that we should do? That we should make the regular service more attractive than it is. In a day when laboring men in the State of New Jersey are being paid as much as \$3 a day working in factories—not skilled mechanics but unskilled mechanics—we are asking men to go into the regular service, to put off their civilian caste and standing, to accept a subordinate position for the first time in their lives inferior in rank to some other man, for \$15 a month.

It was only in 1914 that the Executive order which provided what should be the rations of enlisted men carried food of a character that the ordinary mechanic's son in the United States was getting every day before he went into the Army. I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that so far as he has been able to do it he has reformed one of the most crying abuses in the military service. I approve absolutely and wholly of the ration list as now constituted. As it was constituted when I was connected with the United States service it was a disgrace to this or any other country, and particularly to a country like this, whose people are generous and willing to pay and feed the men who constitute their fighting force.

With an army of 250,000 or 300,000 regulars serving two years with the colors and serving four years in the reserves, you would have each year going into civil life 125,000 men. If, as suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], those 250,000 men were given vocational and educational training during those two years, that time would not be lost either to the men or to the Nation; they would return into the civil walks of life trained soldiers and better citizens than they were when they entered the Army.

The 125,000 men leaving the Army each year and going back to the civil walks of life to earn their own livelihood would be better citizens than they were before, and without the expenditure of the money that we now propose to expend, and for which, in my judgment, we will get nothing, we could have such a system brought about.

Every one of the nations now engaged in this great war relied first upon their regular establishment. We shall have to rely first upon our Regular Establishment, if we have a Regular Establishment worthy of the name. In 10 years, under the operation of a law such as I suggest, we would have 1,250,000 trained soldiers in civil life, every one of whom would or could be in the reserves, connected with the Federal Government, and control over him retained by the Federal Government; and behind that body of reserves and behind that body of regular trained soldiers we could sit back more or less at peace and then see what we could do with the National Guard, and then see what we could do with the volunteer reserve force and the other fads and fancies that arise to the minds of the people in the various sections of the country.

Now, I want to say a word with reference to the National Guard. A good deal of the criticism that has been leveled against the National Guard can be justified. I speak from experience. But I do not believe that the state the National Guard finds itself in to-day is chargeable to the Guard. The National Guard is essentially a State organization, and we are attempting to make a Federal organization out of it. It is good enough for the purposes for which it is intended, but there are constitutional and legal difficulties in the way of making it a good enough force for what we intend it to be.

I believe a man can secure good military training by service in the National Guard. I know the men who went into the volunteer service who had had the benefit of the training of the National Guard were better soldiers than the men who went into the volunteer service without the preliminary training of the National Guard. So I believe it is an easy matter to train men to the point of the efficiency required of the enlisted men; but I do not believe that it is possible for the man who is engaged in the activities of civil life, as a lawyer or as a doctor or as a banker, to devote enough time to the service to become sufficiently proficient in military affairs to be capable of commanding troops.

The enlisted man of the National Guard loves his officers; he has confidence in his officers; and he wants to serve under those officers. It seems to me it would be easy enough to evolve a system whereby, if called into active service by the Govern-

ment, he could be permitted to have over him a certain percentage of his National Guard officers. There could be a framework, a skeleton, of an organization throughout the National Guard; I would say, for instance, each company might be permitted to select its own captain. A certain standard of efficiency might be demanded of him before he accepted his commission; but after he has passed his examinations for captain and is the officer the company desires, and is properly commissioned by the governor and then by the President, that man could be paid sufficient money so that he could devote all his time and attention to the affairs of the National Guard. We could do that, and we could increase the pay of the Regular Army soldiers. Everything which I have suggested could be done. We should then have an efficient force and a powerful and numerous reserve body in this country; and yet we would not begin to expend the amount of money that we are proposing to expend on the experiments on which we are about to enter under this bill.

In other words, if we want an army, if we want to defend this Nation, if we want to feel safe and be at peace, let us get an army of professional soldiers; and behind that front rank of trained, professional fighting men let us organize, equip, and train a volunteer army.

I am sorry that the committee has not gone into this matter in a broader and more fundamental way than they have done. I have about come to the conclusion, after listening to the debates, that it is my duty to vote against section 56. I think I shall devote my energies as much as I can in the direction of providing adequately for the arming, equipping, and paying of the men of the Regular organization, for I believe firmly in my heart that they are the chief reliance of this Nation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not intend to interfere with the Senator, but I do hope that we may be able to get a vote this afternoon on the motion to strike out this section.

Mr. REED. The time that I take will not interfere with that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there has been a good deal said about the National Guard not being available in time of war. One example is worth all the theorizing in the world. I want to read merely a few sentences from a letter written by Gen. Clark, who is the commander of the Missouri National Guard, a lawyer of distinction and ability, and as good a citizen as there is in my State. He writes:

It was stated before the House committee the other day by Mr. Breckinridge, the Assistant Secretary of War, I believe, that at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War only 30 per cent of the National Guard volunteered. I have heard this statement made before, and I wish to say that so far as it applies to the National Guard of this State, it is absolutely without the semblance of truth. The records will show that in 1898, 100 per cent of the National Guard of this State volunteered for service in that war. I am reliably advised that this same condition existed in all of the States. My information is that only one organization in the United States declined to volunteer, and this grew out of some difficulty with the governor over the appointment of its officers. Statements of this kind are not believed by those who make them, and are made with a view solely to discrediting the National Guard.

Mr. President, this question presents itself to me in this form: It is proposed to have a Regular Army of 180,000 men. It is admitted that there will be difficulty in securing that many men for the Regular Army unless the pay is raised or other advantages additional to those now existing are afforded. It is proposed, then, to create a reserve force or a supplementary force to fall back upon in the event of war.

The National Guard exists; it is now reasonably well equipped. It has headquarters, armories, and officers. It is a body of men that certainly is 100 per cent in advance of the condition in which it was at the time the Spanish-American War broke out. It is constantly improving, but during all these years it has clamored for certain assistance, for certain opportunities which have been steadily denied it. This organization can be made a first-class organization.

The fear I have is that our committee—and I do not say it to unjustly charge anything against the committee—have in some way been led to a discrimination against the National Guard.

In illustration of what I am going to say I call attention to the fact that, if I understand this bill, and if others who have written me understand it, correctly, it is proposed that, in case of war and in case of the utilization of the National Guard, the officers above the rank of captain are to be then practically mustered out of the service, because there is no provision for pay for them. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if that is not the exact condition of the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No, Mr. President; they are not mustered out of the service. The bill as it was originally pro-

posed by the National Guard Association paid the higher officers, those above the rank of captain, salaries—quite large salaries—and the committee felt, from the evidence that they had before them, that the practical officer, the training man, the man who had most to do with the Guard, was the captain, because in many States they did not have regimental units, and we provided only for pay up to the grade of captain, except when the Guard were called into service, and then they were to get the pay of their rank.

Mr. REED. I do not think that makes it entirely clear. I have a letter from the colonel of the First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, who makes this comment:

The House bill now before the Senate provides that no officers but the captains and lieutenants of companies shall be paid. This eliminates the colonel, lieutenant colonel, the three majors, and several staff captains and lieutenants.

These men are absolutely necessary to the success of any organization, and, in fact, they are the ones that are compelled to bear a great part of the expense, and it is absolutely unjust that they should not be included in any provision for compensation. Their work, as a matter of fact, is work that there is the least reward to, as they have very little part in the show end of the Guard, and they are continually called on for funds of various kinds to cover expenses. I trust that you will insist on these officers being included as they were under the provisions of the Hay bill.

Section 112 of this same bill provides that officers and men who have signed the agreement and received compensation for their service may be called into the service in time of war. You can readily see that this is a joker by which all field and staff officers would be eliminated in case of trouble, and no one go into the field except the companies. In other words, the entire regiment as an organization would be destroyed.

Mr. President, here is this organization existing. As has been demonstrated in these debates, it has repeatedly proven its efficiency. As was stated the other day in the debate, in about five or six hours' time they were able in the State of Ohio to mobilize at one point 2,000 of these men. Instead of cutting down this organization, which exists, we ought to build it up.

Now what is proposed? To create a grand army of enthusiasm that is going to meet once a year for about 30 days, which I frankly admit can be gotten together to some extent during a time of war excitement, but which I utterly deny we have a single line of experience in this or any other country to warrant us in believing will come together on ordinary occasions. We are told that these gentlemen can come out for 30 days once a year, but that they can not join the National Guard. I want to know why? I want to know why a man who can give 30 days' time every year in the middle of the summer can not also give one night a week to attend drill at an armory? I say that you will encounter the greatest disappointment you have ever met with if you undertake to make an army by calling together an unorganized body of men—for that is what it will be—for 30 days each year, then allowing them to disintegrate and go to their homes. An army without headquarters, without equipment, and without cohesion. If these men come voluntarily and in great numbers at first, you will find that they will speedily disappear and disintegrate, like gentlemen do who go to a camp meeting and get enthusiastic, and then, after the camp meeting is over, nearly all forget there ever was a camp meeting. You will not get an army in that way; and if you spend \$25,000,000 in that way, you will have burned up that much money without result.

There is a way you can employ that money and get a result. Twenty-five million dollars would pay \$100 a year to 250,000 students in the schools and colleges in this country; it would pay the tuition of many of them; it would enable many a boy to go to school who can not now attend; you would reach the boy at a period of life when he has the time to devote and the energy to give to a military training. Why not use that money in advancing military science amongst those boys or young men who are already mobilized in your schools; who are already, figuratively speaking, in the camps; who are there where they can be reached? Why can you get them? First, because they are already mobilized; second, because young and ambitious men will enlist in companies and be willing to serve because they are associated with men like themselves—with their fellow students. There is no humiliation in such service; on the contrary, there is an inspiration in it. There would be a thronging into the ranks of schoolboys who would be willing to serve for a small compensation, and, as has been suggested here, the physical exercise and all that goes with military training would well repay our country for the money so expended.

I do not want to see an attempt made here to create three different kinds of armies. I do not want an army made up of shreds and patches. A Regular Army is absolutely all right, and I am willing to vote for a Regular Army of generous size; but back of that there ought to be one army, one organization, one system; and to its creation we should devote our energies. Then

if, in addition, you go into your public schools and give a general training to the youth of this country, you will in the end so disseminate military knowledge and discipline as to give abundant strength to the country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon suggests the absence of a quorum. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Harding	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Brandegee	Hollis	O'Gorman	Sterling
Broussard	Hughes	Oliver	Stone
Catron	Husting	Overman	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Page	Swanson
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Taggart
Clapp	Jones	Pomerene	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Ransdell	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Reed	Vardaman
Culberson	Lane	Robinson	Walsh
Cummins	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
Curtis	Lippitt	Shafroth	Weeks
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
du Pont	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Simmons	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] to strike out section 56. On that the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. Unless I can obtain a transfer, I shall not be able to vote.

Mr. KERN (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on official business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. In his absence I withhold by vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GEORNA], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I am informed, however, that if present he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona].

Mr. LEWIS (when Mr. TILMAN's name was called). I simply wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] and to say, by his permission, that if he were present and were permitted by his pair to vote he would vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg to announce a pair between the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], who is unavoidably detained, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].



Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If the Senator from Connecticut were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], who is detained from the Senate on important business.

Mr. TOWNSEND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. Not being able to obtain a transfer of that pair, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 36, as follows:

## YEAS—34.

Ashurst	Hughes	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Jones	Page	Stone
Clapp	Kenyon	Ransdell	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Reed	Taggart
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Thompson
Cummins	Lewis	Shafroth	Vardaman
Curtis	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Gore	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Ga.	

## NAYS—36.

Beckham	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Borah	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smoot
Brandeggee	Hollis	O'Gorman	Sterling
Broussard	Husting	Oliver	Sutherland
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polindexter	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Pomerene	Warren
Dillingham	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Weeks
du Pont	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams

## NOT VOTING—26.

Brady	Goff	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Gronna	Myers	Tillman
Burleigh	Harding	Owen	Townsend
Chilton	James	Penrose	Underwood
Colt	La Follette	Phelan	Wadsworth
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Shields	
Fletcher	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	

So the motion of Mr. LEE of Maryland was rejected.

## APPLICATIONS FOR PAROLE (S. DOC. NO. 389).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 28th ultimo, certain information relative to the operation of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended by the act of June 23, 1913, relative to the number of applications for parole under the law, etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1916.

Hon. JAMES M. BAKER,  
Secretary United States Senate.

SIR: In accordance with the Senate resolution of the 28th ultimo asking for information relative to the operation of the act of June 25, 1910, and as amended by the act of June 23, 1913 (parole act), I have to inform you that there have been made 5,735 applications for parole under this law up to this date. Of this number, 1,756 have been recommended for parole by the board of which the warden is a member, 1,446 paroles have been granted, and there are 91 cases still pending.

In a very few cases the warden, acting as a member of the parole board, may have voted for parole and been overruled by the other two members of the board. It would be a very difficult matter to ascertain the number of such cases, and I am assuming that the words "recommended by the warden" appearing in the resolution were intended to read "recommended by the parole board."

Respectfully,

T. W. GREGORY, Attorney General.

## DISTRICT GASLIGHT COMPANIES (S. DOC. NO. 390).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 14th ultimo, certain information as to the action taken by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enforce section 11 of the act of Congress of March 4, 1913, relative to the Washington Gas Light Co. and the Georgetown Gas Light Co., both of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,  
COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
Washington, April 4, 1916.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,  
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit the following on the resolution passed by the Senate March 14, 1916, which provides—

"That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to report to the Senate as soon as practicable what steps, if any, have been taken by them since September 10, 1913, to enforce section 11 of the act of Congress entitled 'An act making

appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes,' approved March 4, 1913, so far as the same may affect the Washington Gas Light Co. and the Georgetown Gas Light Co., both of the District of Columbia."

Pursuant to the instructions of the commissioners, the corporation counsel, on September 15, 1913, filed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia a bill in equity against the Washington Gas Light Co., asking for the dissolution of the company because it was holding certain stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. in violation of the anti-merger act of March 4, 1913. The bill prayed not only for a dissolution of the company but also for a sale of the stock so owned and held by the company. The Georgetown Gas Light Co. was made a party to this cause.

The gas companies answered the bill, issue was joined, and the case went to a hearing on the 5th of February, 1914.

Prior to the filing of this bill Thomas L. Hume had filed a bill, as one of the stockholders of the Washington Gas Light Co., against this company to have the stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. held by it sold and the proceeds distributed among the stockholders of the Washington Gas Light Co.

The Georgetown Gas Light Co. has also filed a bill against the Washington Gas Light Co. to have the same stock canceled and declared null and void because purchased and held in violation of law.

These three cases were consolidated and came on to be heard before Justices Gould and Stafford, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; evidence was taken therein and they were argued and submitted to the court for its decision on the 5th day of February, 1914. No decision has as yet been handed down by the court.

Very respectfully,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
By O. P. NEWMAN, President.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5016) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 103) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1809. An act to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey;

S. 3391. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913;

S. 5977. An act to authorize the Shamokin, Sunbury & Lewisburg Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., to Monroe township, Snyder County, Pa.;

S. 3978. An act to authorize the Catawissa Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a bridge across the west branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., to the borough of West Milton, Union County, Pa.;

S. 4190. An act authorizing the Yankton County Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.;

H. R. 8466. An act to relieve J. Lawrence Latham, postmaster at Eupora, Webster County, Miss., of the payment of cash and funds stolen from the post office; and

H. R. 13769. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to supply tents for temporary use of the sufferers from the recent conflagration in Paris, Tex., and for other purposes.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for prohibition of liquor traffic in the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Island and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, representing approximately a membership of 300 ministers and an equal number of lay representatives, in its annual session in Foundry Church, Washington, D. C., Bishop Earl Cranston, D. D., LL. D., presiding, having learned from reliable sources of the sad havoc made by the liquor traffic among the natives of the Hawaiian Islands, whose death rate has been greatly accelerated by the use of alcoholic drink, for which they have a peculiar weakness, and having also learned that the saloons of Honolulu are a constant and alarming menace to the physical and moral welfare of the many thousands of our American soldiers garrisoned on the island of Oahu, far from home, surrounded by many temptations, with few restraints: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we most respectfully and earnestly petition both Houses of Congress now in session in favor of the passage of the bill pending in the Senate and House for the prohibition of the liquor traffic in the Territory of Hawaii.

Our interest in this matter is all the more vital and paramount because of the missionary and educational work now being prosecuted

on the islands by our representative mission boards for the uplift of the many weaker races domiciled there beneath the flag.

In conformity with the foregoing and by order of the conference, we the undersigned, affix hereto our official signatures.

EARL CRANSTON, *President*.  
FRANK G. PORTER, *Secretary*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 4, 1916.

Mr. HUGHES presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., praying for an investigation into conditions surrounding the marketing of dairy products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of California, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lingle, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Bangor, Me., praying for military and naval defense of Penobscot Bay, Me., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of sundry citizens of Carpenter, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of J. D. Bishop and sundry other citizens of Garfield, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of Local Grange No. 201, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bellingham, and of William Valley Grange, No. 452, Patrons of Husbandry, of Deer Park, in the State of Washington, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange No. 201, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bellingham, and of Stranger Creek Grange, No. 374, Patrons of Husbandry, of Daisy, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorials of E. C. Kellogg and sundry other citizens, of College Place, and of C. D. Threlkeld and sundry other citizens, of Auburn, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Burnt Valley Grange, No. 509, Patrons of Husbandry, of Chewelah, Wash., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 5401) to aid the State of Maryland to construct a military and post road, to be known as the National Defense Highway, connecting the United States Naval Academy grounds at Annapolis, the capital of Maryland, and the seat of the Federal Government, the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 5402) granting a pension to Charles Railey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 5403) authorizing the President to appoint John Gibbon a major and quartermaster in the Quartermaster's Department of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5404) granting a pension to Victor Tucker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 5405) granting an increase of pension to Francis Roy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 5406) for the enlargement, etc., of the assay office in the city of New York (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

#### RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to state again, while Senators are all here, that beginning to-morrow, in order to speed this measure as much as possible, I shall ask that the Senate remain in session in the evening.

I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., Thursday, April 6, 1916), the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, April 7, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us, O Lord, Thy ways and incline our hearts to walk therein in spite of the temptations, trials, and barriers in the way. It is not ease, inertia, that makes the manly man, but the earnest, sincere efforts to do things worth while. "In the world ye shall have tribulations, but be of good cheer—I have overcome the world." The earnest for every truth-loving, noble-minded, self-sacrificing man, who lives to a purpose. So may we live and aspire, to be and to do, that the peace which passeth understanding may be ours, now and evermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 13006) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana, and the maintenance and operation of the bridge so reconstructed.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE WABASH RIVER.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to correct a mistake made on Monday in an emergency bill for a bridge. Overlooking the fact that an identical Senate bill was on the Speaker's table, a House bill was passed and sent to the Senate, but it was recalled. It is H. R. 13006. I ask unanimous consent that it be reconsidered and all proceedings vacated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all proceedings by which the bill H. R. 13006 was passed be vacated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be considered. It is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5016) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana.

*Be it enacted*, etc., That the Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Co., and Walter L. Ross, its receiver, their successors or assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to reconstruct the bridge of said company and operate the same across the Wabash River at or near Silverwood, Ind., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the line of the existing bridge of said company, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.



The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table; and the bill H. R. 13006 was laid on the table.

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House of the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12193, the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abercrombie	Estopinal	Hulbert	Pou
Alexander	Fairchild	Jones	Price
Anthony	Farr	Kelster	Ramseyer
Aswell	Finley	Kennedy, Iowa	Roberts, Mass.
Barchfield	Flynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Rodenberg
Beales	Focht	Lazaro	Sabath
Bennet	Freeman	Lehlbach	Sanford
Black	Gallagher	Lewis	Scott, Pa.
Bruckner	Gardner	Liebel	Scully
Brumbaugh	Garland	Linthicum	Sells
Buchanan, Ill.	Garrett	Lobeck	Sherley
Byrnes, S. C.	Glass	Loft	Snyder
Callaway	Goodwin	Loud	Stephens, Miss.
Cantrill	Gould	McAndrews	Stephens, Tex.
Charles	Graham	McCulloch	Stiness
Cooper, Ohio	Gray, Ala.	McKenzie	Sutherland
Copley	Gray, Ind.	McKinley	Tilson
Crago	Griest	Maher	Tinkham
Decker	Guernsey	Meeker	Vare
	Hamill	Mooney	Venable
Dension	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Ward
Dent	Hart	Morrin	Watkins
Dewalt	Haskell	Morrison	Watson, Pa.
Doremus	Haugen	Mott	Williams, W. E.
Drukker	Hay	Nichols, Mich.	Winslow
Dyer	Hayes	North	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Henry	Oglesby	Young, N. Dak.
Eagle	Hill	Patten	Young, Tex.
Edmons	Hilliard	Peters	
Edwards	Houston	Porter	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 312 Members—a quorum—have responded to their names.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for a week, on account of important business.

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12193, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] will take the chair in the absence of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who is detained in committee.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12193, the river and harbor bill, with Mr. RUBEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12193) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is pending, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GOON: On page 9, line 12, after the word "improvement," strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] desire?

Mr. FREAR. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes—5 to be used by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and 5 by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I think the request was on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes—5 to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin and 5 by myself.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] would like 5 minutes on his amendment, and he has another amendment on which he would like 5 minutes.

Mr. GOON. I have another amendment to offer in the event this amendment is not adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will confine myself at present to this one amendment, and ask that debate on it close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], 5 by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON], and 5 by the gentleman from Florida. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose on Tuesday the amendment before the House was upon lines 11 and 12 of the bill, appropriating \$1,000,000 for the Norfolk and Beaufort waterway, so called. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] reduces the million-dollar appropriation contained in the bill to \$200,000, which is intended, as he stated, to cover the amount that would be required to keep the Government dredges employed, and is intended also to strike out the \$800,000, which would be let to private contract at a rate 80 per cent in excess of what it would be if the work were performed by the Government.

I wish to speak more particularly in response to what was suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] at that time. He had quite an extended discussion of the subject of the commerce conveyed by this canal and also about the amount of money that had been appropriated and will be appropriated for this waterway. He stated that 603,000 tons would be carried by the Dismal Swamp Canal and this canal if they were thrown together. But, Mr. Chairman, that is an impossibility under existing conditions. There are two canals reaching down from Norfolk to the South. One goes to Elizabeth City, 30 miles inland—and I know this because I have been over it. It is about 60 miles from Norfolk to Elizabeth City. By this other canal route it would be 120 miles between these points. Col. Taylor conceded that some of the commerce, or much of the commerce, which goes over the Dismal Swamp Canal originates along that canal. There are two towns on that canal—Norfolk, a large city, and another city of considerable importance, Elizabeth City, on the Dismal Swamp Canal. The purpose of this Beaufort Canal is to drive that Dismal Swamp Canal out of business; as the engineers say, into bankruptcy. But you can not take away the little traffic they have over there, because the conditions are different. This canal will never carry it. This canal carries only about 85,000 tons outside of the wood and ties and logs that could be carried on a 9-foot waterway, the existing depth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FREAR. For just a moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman indicated that the commerce here was largely local.

Mr. FREAR. No; I did not intend to indicate that. Some of it comes from the South by a barge line. The total amount is 209,000 tons this year and 258,000 tons the year before and includes both local and other freight.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is mistaken in that. One company has carried at least 600,000 tons in the last year.

Mr. FREAR. Well, if that be true, Mr. Chairman, the company referred to did not carry it through the canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will inform the gentleman that 100 new barges are operating in that canal.

Mr. FREAR. I can not yield further, Mr. Chairman. I am sustaining my statement by the official records. The Engineer's reports have not been questioned heretofore. We have appropriated a little over a million dollars on the canal thus far. It is through an unsettled country. There are not a hundred thou-

sand people living in that neighborhood. I think not 50,000; I think, in fact, Senator Burton showed there were not 25,000 people living there. It is a \$5,400,000 item, and there is no telling what the end of this will be, and there is practically no important commerce on it. On the Erie Canal the commerce has practically been driven off, and as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] said the other day, there is no waterway traffic in the United States that amounts to anything outside of the deep waterway canals. This is only a shallow canal. It was bought over from a private company by the United States at a cost of \$500,000 and is a poor investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use but two minutes on this amendment, and I reserve the other three minutes for the other amendment.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman can not do that.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that \$200,000 shall be appropriated for this work for this year. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that not more than \$200,000 could be used in the operation of the Government plant. The Army engineers state that it cost the Government 4.3 cents per cubic yard, place measurement, to do the work with its own plant, while the contractors are paid more than 7.5 cents per cubic yard for the work done by them. My amendment will give the Army engineers all the money they can expend next year by keeping the Government plant in operation. If done in that way, the work will be done at a cost of approximately 4.3 cents. If this amendment prevails, it will take longer to do the work; but it will not cost much more than half the amount of money to do it that it will cost if this work is done by private contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I sympathize with any effort that gentlemen may make here to reduce the cost of this class of work to a minimum; but the amendment of the gentleman, in my opinion, would not have that effect. My judgment is that it would make the work cost a great deal more than it will cost if we proceed in the way we have proceeded heretofore. No one can tell at this time what kind of a bid may be submitted by a would-be contractor. Whatever bid is submitted, the House may rest assured that the Government engineers and the War Department are not going to allow any more than is absolutely necessary to get the work done, as they always reserve the right to reject any or all bids. I want to say, further, that the Government dredging plants, of which the Government has a large number, costing about \$15,000,000, with a present value of about \$12,000,000, have had the effect of reducing very materially the amount charged by contractors. I remember when I first entered this body, 21 years ago, that in my section of the country it was costing five or six or seven times as much to do a given amount of dredging as the contractors charge now for the same kind of work, and that reduction is very largely because of the fact that we have quite a number of plants in that section of the country. Now if it is necessary to apply any remedy, the true remedy is to build more dredges. But I doubt very materially if it is necessary, because we are getting this work done almost as cheaply, perhaps quite as cheaply, as it can possibly be done. There may be now and then an isolated case where a contractor may make more than he ought to make; but in the main they do not, and I wish to say, further, that neither the gentleman from Iowa nor anyone else can tell what the bids for this particular work are going to be.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The report of the Army engineers was that for the last year the Government had constructed by private contract over 14 miles, at 7½ cents plus per cubic yard, and had constructed a little over 2 miles by Government plant, at a cost of 4.3 cents.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That probably is caused by the fact that in some places the Government work can be done a little more cheaply than in other places. At some places where they have a plant already constructed and not much wear and tear, the cost to the Government is very small, whereas in other places it is much larger. It is the average cost which ought to be considered.

Mr. GOOD. Where the cost to the Government is larger the report of the Army engineers shows that there is usually a greater difference between the cost by Government plant and the cost by private contract.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You can not fix the price in advance if you are going to have any work at all done by private contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] how he can say that

the Government engineers and the War Department will not pay private contractors more than it will cost the Government to do this work, when they have already paid more in previous years? Have these officers reformed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not say that. The gentleman misunderstood me. It may and does in some instances cost more, but I remember at least one case where it cost the Government more to do the work than it would have cost to have it done by private contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida, since the Government is going to continue to improve rivers year after year, and it is a permanent business, whether he does not think that as a general rule the Government itself ought to do it when it can save millions of dollars by so doing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois wants to turn all that class of work over to the Government, of course it may be done, but I do not think it ought to be done.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the gentleman opposed to the Government doing it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am willing for it to do whatever is necessary, but if it undertakes to do it all the gentleman will find that instead of a plant costing \$15,000,000 it is going to take twice or three times that to equip the Government to do this kind of work. If you want to embark on that plan, all right, but you want to first count the cost.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, is there any time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has three minutes remaining, which he reserved for use on another amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Have I any time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there will be another amendment, and the gentleman can get his opportunity on that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well, I will wait.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FREAR) there were—ayes 57, noes 74.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Good: On page 9, at the end of line 12, change the period to a colon and insert:

"Provided, That no part thereof shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by a Government plant."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the House never wants to do a foolish thing. It never wants to do a thing that it is obliged to apologize for or go back upon. The fortification bill reported this morning contains this provision practically as I have offered it, as applied to this bill; that is, that private contractors shall not have more than 25 per cent on their contracts in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government contract. You are going to be called upon to a man on that side of the aisle to support that proposition when the fortification bill is up for consideration, and when you do I commend your vote, for you will support it then, because I believe it is sound, I believe it is right, I believe that when you write that into the law on a bill covering \$20,000,000 you are doing a courageous and patriotic thing, and I think you will be doing just as courageous a thing, just as patriotic a thing if you write it into a law appropriating \$40,000,000 for river and harbor improvements.

And yet you voted down this proposition limiting contractors to reasonable profits the other day, and I take it that you are going to vote it down to-day, but how are you going to explain your action to the constituents that you represent, on a bill appropriating \$40,000,000, on this item appropriating a million dollars, more than \$300,000 of which is purely pork, according to the statement of the Army engineers.

As to the quarrel between the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SMALL], as to the amount of tonnage on this canal, I



have but little to say. I have confined my statement to the report made by the chairman of the committee that the total tonnage of the canal last year was 229,047 tons. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from North Carolina say that it is over 600,000 tons, but nowhere in the Army Engineer's report, nowhere in the report of the chairman of the committee, can you find more than 229,047 tons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this item, as I stated before, the Army engineers report that we are paying private contractors more than 7½ cents for doing the work, while the Government is doing the work for 4.3 cents, and my amendment simply limits the private contractor to a profit of 25 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPARKMAN) there were 83 ayes and 50 noes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 80 ayes and 59 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, an amendment which is in line with Government ownership has just been passed by the committee, and it invites attention, since it applies directly to one of the great projects along the Atlantic seaboard. I have no quarrel with those Representatives who in good faith oppose waterway improvement, but those who live along the coast line sometimes wonder at the lack of interest in the matter of commerce and preparedness of those who come from the interior. No longer ago than day before yesterday one of the most distinguished men of his time, a man whom I have followed in fair weather and in foul, the great ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. CANNON], stood upon this floor and made a speech which, respect him as I do, I am obliged to observe would have been remarkable if made anywhere within 100 miles of the Atlantic seaboard. In that speech he undertook, in opposition to the construction of a connecting waterway along the coast, to say that if the people in his valley of the Wabash could move the Atlantic Ocean over they would be grateful, since they would like to have the sea to go upon.

I do not think the gentleman would stand for that as an argument even in his own country, because it is untenable, as was the suggestion made by our distinguished leader on this side of the House [Mr. MANN] in the discussion of the river and harbor bill two or three years ago, when, in opposition to some eastern project, he suggested, in happy vein, the construction through the Rocky Mountains of a canal to connect Chicago with the Pacific Ocean.

In considering the bill we have just passed along a strip of country which, if you gentlemen who voted for the amendment were familiar with it, would at once point out to you the error of that vote. Not so much as it pertains to Government ownership, which you seemingly have voted into this bill, but because the effect may be to stop a great work, if, perchance, private contractors, with all the odium that attaches to the name, in these times of increased prices of material and labor, can not compete to the extent of 25 per cent with the Government plants, which have the overhead charges paid at the outset. There can be but one meaning to that amendment, and that is to impede, if not to stop, the business that is being done on the inside waterways of the Atlantic seaboard. And yet the votes have come, in part, from Atlantic Coast States, in spite of the representations of your own people, in spite of the resolutions passed by chambers of commerce and boards of trade and by business men and others engaged in shipping. You have joined our great leader on this side to vote out of this bill an important and needed improvement, demanded by your own constituents.

What does this coastal project mean? My great and good friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] indicates that what is proposed to be done here is to build an inside waterway along the Atlantic coast "6 miles from the sea." Oh, with all respect to one whom I love and admire, the gentleman from Illinois would do well to take up the geography that he studied in his

North Carolina days and he would then understand how unfair and how inaccurate that statement is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want this time in order that I may have an opportunity to tell my Republican friends along the Atlantic seaboard what the people will think of them when they come to realize that their Representatives have fallen in here under the banner of a Government-ownership proposition to defeat the great work that the people want done along the Atlantic seaboard—a work for commerce and preparedness, not for the people of the Atlantic coast but for all the people of the United States. My friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], with a splendid sweep of that strong left arm of his, indicated that preparedness upon a 6-foot channel or with a 10-foot or a 12-foot channel was ridiculous, and yet every one of you who has been following the story of the European war knows that the 6-foot channel in Germany has been the salvation of the German people in this great trial through which they are passing. [Applause.]

Every one of you who recalls the floods in Paris will remember that it was the barge on a six or seven foot canal that saved the people of that city and brought them food and munitions. What are we doing along our own coast? I want the men from Maine, the men from Vermont, the men from New Hampshire, the men from Massachusetts and New York, as well as those from Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia, to understand what they have done. I want to rouse them up to a sense of their duty. Apparently they have voted to stop business unless the Government goes into the contract business to construct this waterway. It will delay the work—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not now—delay the work on this waterway between Norfolk and Beaufort. On Saturday last I pointed out the great advantages of the waterway along the upper coast. This Beaufort reach is a connecting link running south, and what does it do? It carries our commerce inside the coast line from the sea as far as 50 miles from Cape Hatteras, the most dreaded point along the Atlantic seaboard, and which every mariner fears.

Oh, if some of you from the mountain tops, from the valleys of the interior, if some of you from along "the banks of the Wabash" would only go down there and look at the graveyard of the ships that have been piling up during the last 200 years you would not vote as you did a little while ago against proceeding with the work upon this inside course.

We are entitled to protection from Cape Hatteras. The people expect it. They want a safe passage for human life, a safe passage for thousands of tons of commerce which should not be driven to death in the open sea. I cite to you the case of three barges in distress on the Atlantic ocean yesterday. They were compelled to go outside because they were drawing too much water for the inside course. Their signals of distress were answered by a revenue cutter, and we are told that they were brought back safely to port. But what of the ships and the barges that are lost? Let gentlemen from Chicago answer this question. What have you done to help us?

During the 10 years from 1900 to 1909, according to statistics well confirmed, coming from the life-saving bureau of this Government, there were no less than 5,700 disasters to shipping along the Atlantic seaboard, many of them off Cape Hatteras, which you, my dear friend from Iowa [Mr. Good], would probably deny the advantage of an inside passage.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will give the gentleman some figures that will convince him before I yield.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean to say that if we put a provision upon this bill which limits the profit of dredges to 25 per cent, will stop this improvement, when the farmers of Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana, according to Government reports, receive less than 3 per cent upon their investment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hold no brief for the dredgers, but I will venture to tell the gentleman that the farmers of Iowa are more prosperous to-day and are making more money than are the dredgers along the Atlantic seaboard. I challenge the gentleman to deny that statement; your farmers are prosperous and they are prosperous because they are selling their

grain and their products to those of us along the Atlantic seaboard who are trying to safeguard your business.

Mr. GOOD. I simply quote from two Government reports, one from the Agricultural Department, and the other the report of the engineers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman has done it in the name of the farmers who are most prosperous at the present time.

Mr. GOOD. I have done it in the name of an empty Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There were 5,700 disasters on the Atlantic seaboard during the 10 years following 1900. How many lives were lost in those disasters? It may not make any difference to you out West, possibly, but the total number of lives lost was 2,200. There is a fine old story which runs that it does not make any difference how many boys are killed in battle or how many go down in the ships, provided they are not your boys. Some of these 2,200 perhaps were western boys. They were our sons, our brothers, our fathers, heads of families, and they went down in those 10 years because, forsooth, we did not give them a safe inside passage. The material side of it may not be so important, but with those 2,200 lives went down \$40,000,000 worth of property. It was the property of people all over the United States.

Why, men of Congress, if you had given us those \$40,000,000 we would have built this inside waterway that by brother FEAR, of Wisconsin, and my brother CALLAWAY, of Texas, are worrying about, all the way from New York down south below the terrors of Cape Hatteras. I want you to think over the vote that you cast to-day, and I trust that you will not cast any more of the same kind. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida to close debate upon this paragraph in five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What amendment is before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. A pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] can make his speech on another pro forma amendment.

Mr. FEAR. But I want to talk on this particular waterway.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Florida by making it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 55, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out "5" and making it "15."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 53, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out "5" and inserting "10."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 67.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. MANN and Mr. SPARKMAN took their places as tellers. The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 57, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a motion before the House to close debate. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] to close debate in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 54.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. MANN and Mr. SPARKMAN took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 48.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] and also, incidentally, in opposition to the remarks which he just made. I was surprised a short time ago when the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors declined to accept the amendment which was last offered by the gentleman from Iowa, my colleague [Mr. Goon]. I can not understand at this time how any Member could have voted against this amendment except on the theory that the committee ought to on all occasions and under all circumstances be sustained, regardless of the merits presented by the amendment which is offered.

Mr. Chairman, it has been repeated in the newspapers of the present day, iterated and reiterated, that the reason that this House is not voting more money for so-called preparedness is because a large majority of the Members of this House are too much interested in "pork-barrel" propositions. I do not care to consider that matter at this time, because I know, and every Member of this House knows, that, no matter what the vote on this bill for rivers and harbors may be, no matter what the amount that will be appropriated by it, it will not have the slightest effect on the amount that is awarded for preparation against invasion or for war.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not at this time.

I do not know what defense could have been made to this amendment. There is nothing which would be more likely to bring this House into contempt and derision before the country than refusing to adopt the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon]. The only objection that was made against it was the one which was made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], that he thought instead of reducing the expense it would increase it, and that objection was made to the original amendment of my colleague. When it was introduced in such form that that objection could not be made, then comes my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] with a tearful plea for the sailors who are being wrecked along the coast.

Mr. Chairman, if I had a tenth part of the wealth that some of the gentleman's constituents possess and felt so sorry for the sailors that are obliged to go through the stormy regions of Cape Hatteras as he seems to feel, I would build a dredge myself and take the contract for less than 25 per cent above what it costs the Government to perform it. Why is it that these dredge owners will not enter into these contracts since this amendment was adopted? What do they want? Do they want 50 per cent or 100 per cent or 200 per cent higher than the Government price, or do they want more money to spend on banquets and to entertain people that they think can have some influence upon this House in the matter of these appropriations? That was all shown in statements made by my colleague by quotations from these very men who have been taking these contracts at an exorbitant price.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not take the banquet proposition seriously, does he, as affecting Members of Congress?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not. I am happy to say that no one believes anything of that kind would affect Members of Congress; but these gentlemen who instituted these banquets seem to think that possibly they may have some effect, judging from the statements they have made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I decline to yield further.

Regardless of the banquet proposition, there was one matter that was plainly brought out, and that was that these contractors were in a pool and a trust to hold up the Government and extract from the Government exorbitant and unreasonable prices for doing this work, and the amendment merely provided against their continuing so to do.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted, and the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Was that motion to close debate on the section and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. It was on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MANN. What became of the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment was withdrawn, or it will be considered as withdrawn, if there is no objection.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Morehead City, N. C.: For maintenance, \$2,600.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] and adopted by the House was, I think, very proper, and it does not mean, in my judgment, that, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], there is to be Government ownership and Government operation of all these works. I know something of the work done by the Government dredges and by private contract on the Great Lakes.

Mr. CALDWELL. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Has the gentleman the right to discuss any other amendment than the one striking out the last word, following an amendment which has been passed? I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If there is any question about being in order, I shall offer such an amendment as will make my remarks in order. I think the House should not be too particular, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I understood that the motion that was adopted was that all debate on this paragraph be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair knows.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is already recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought a point of order was made against his proceeding.

Mr. CALDWELL. I object to his proceeding, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I said I had some knowledge of the work done by the Government itself and by private contractors on the Great Lakes, and I know that the work done by the Government dredges has brought about a reduction of prices paid to the private contractors. It has not resulted in the Government doing all the work. It has not resulted in construction of Government plants sufficient to do a great part of the work. It has simply resulted in more reasonable contracts by private contractors.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] argued, that it has slightly increased the private contracts with respect to that canal?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. My remarks are directed to this proposition, that it will not result in Government ownership and Government operation, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] so much fears.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And the gentleman says also that in calculating the cost of work done by Government dredges, no account is taken of overhead expenses. I know that charge has been made concerning work on the Great Lakes, and it has been refuted. I wish to say that if the Government engineers operating under the direction contained in the amendment just adopted would make estimates of the cost of Government dredging without taking into account the overhead charges and all costs and charges that would have to be incurred by private contractors doing like work, they would not be worthy of the

positions they occupy, and they ought to be court-martialed. I do not believe there will be any such style of figuring on the part of Government engineers.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] is always forceful and sometimes interesting, but he is not always convincing or helpful to the House. The trouble with him is that he argues with the same force and vehemence respecting all propositions, good, bad, and indifferent, arguing with the same force this morning as yesterday when he defended those dinky little things which local enthusiasts call harbors on the coast of New Jersey. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Pardon me; I have not the time. One of those projects is Cold Spring Inlet, N. J., for which this bill carries an appropriation of \$40,000 for maintenance. Concerning this project, or this harbor, as the local interests are pleased to call it, Capt. Lockwood, of the Corps of Engineers, in his report to Congress says:

The project of improvement if carried to completion will be of material benefit to the city of Cape May as a pleasure resort by filling the adjacent swamp lands, obliterating mosquito-breeding beds, and furnishing opportunity for expansion of building sites.

We find also in the report made by Capt. Flagler, of the Corps of Engineers, the following statement concerning this project. The report says that it—

would also permit a resumption of the yacht races that were at one time sailed at Cape May and formed the most attractive event of the season. The Cape May cup, an international trophy. I am informed, is now sailed for at New York. Together with the projects in real estate improvement at Cape May, the establishment of a secure harbor would, I am sure, largely increase the present patronage of summer visitors at this locality.

So river and harbor bills in the past have carried appropriations, and this bill carries an appropriation of money, under the guise of improving a harbor and providing for navigation, for the purpose of reclaiming swamp lands, exterminating mosquitoes, adding to the area of land for building sites, and for the purpose of assisting Cape May to compete with New York in the matter of regattas and yacht races. The only reason urged by the chairman of the committee for making this appropriation is that large sums of money have heretofore been expended, and, in order to maintain a semblance of a harbor, it is necessary for the Government to go on year after year spending money. The reports of engineers show that this project was approved in the first instance with the idea and with the hope that a large amount of commerce of great value would be worked up, it being estimated that the value of the commerce would be more than two million and a quarter dollars annually, but the commerce in 1914 was only 6,193 tons, with a valuation of \$103,000.

In my judgment there is but one proper course to be pursued respecting this project. The business of the harbor has not developed in accordance with the expectations of the engineers and others who urged the improvement; the entire project is a failure and further expenditure by the Government is not a good proposition; in fact, it is absolute waste of money. If the improvement results only in draining swamps, killing mosquitoes, adding to the attractiveness of a summer resort, and providing for safety of racing yachts, it ought not to be maintained at the expense of the Government. If it is of real value for these purposes, the local interests, after having been generously supplied with money by the Federal Government, ought to be willing, as they are surely abundantly able, to maintain the harbor, if it may be so called, at their own expense.

Appropriations of money for such projects as this tend to justify charges made against river and harbor appropriations; they support the charge that this is pork-barrel legislation; and every legitimate project in the country and water commerce in general throughout the country suffer.

I speak as I do because I represent a district which has a number of harbors, every one of them doing business of an amount and character to justify Federal aid, and because I believe items like the one I have referred to in New Jersey weaken the bill and delay and interfere with appropriations for worthy projects.

It is not possible for one who is not a member of the committee to be familiar with many of the projects for which appropriations are recommended, nor am I able to say, or willing to believe, that the bill favors many projects like the Cold Spring Inlet project, but the presence of this project justifies some suspicion of the entire bill. I hope some way will be found to eliminate it and others like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" standing up for those things along the Atlantic seaboard that he thinks necessary to the preservation and promotion of life and property. The gentleman from Michigan never hesitates to ask for those things for the farm that he wants. When the Agricultural appropriation bill comes along the gentleman does not say anything about "pork barrel." When the Agricultural appropriation bill is under consideration we always find the gentleman from Michigan advocating the measures contained therein. But in keeping with the activity of the Chicago Tribune and other newspapers that do not know much about the subject, we hear him finding fault with the river and harbor bill. I would like the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois—the distinguished gentleman who has spoken frequently upon this floor upon this proposition—to know that up to 1907, according to the statistics of a White House conference, the amount of money taken out of the Treasury of the United States for the Mississippi Valley, to "clean out mosquitoes," and to build levees from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, was \$208,000,000 out of a total of \$552,000,000 from the beginning of time, and I would like the gentlemen from the Great Lakes territory and from the Mississippi Valley territory to know that while they were taking out this \$208,000,000 of a total of \$552,000,000, the Atlantic seaboard from the beginning of time, in the busy area of the original Thirteen States, received only \$141,000,000. A pretty fair showing for the Middle West, considering its comparative youth!

The gentleman from Michigan talks here as if he knew something about the Atlantic coast; he says this great project, serving territory where we have the commerce, where we have the population, where we have the shipping, where we do more than 50 per cent of the manufacturing is for the purpose of wiping out the mosquitoes. Why, in his Agricultural bill the gentleman will not give a dollar to wipe out mosquitoes. He wants to take every dollar for the diseases of his cattle and horses, for seeds and soil, and for farm instruction. There is no "pork" in that. If there is, the gentleman can not see it. His farmer is the most prosperous man in the land to-day, but the gentleman comes along with his Agricultural bill, and the burden of the taxation is borne by the people along the Atlantic coast as well as his own. But the gentleman sees nothing in that to criticize. [Applause.]

Now, I am going to tell the gentleman something I think he should know. He harps, as a number of others from the Lakes country do, on the tremendous tonnage of the Soo Canal. I am glad it is large. I am as proud of it as he is, but when he says the facts as to the Atlantic coast, as I have stated them, are not convincing, he should be informed of his error. I have taken the trouble to look it up—the matter of tonnage—and I want the facts to be known. I will put them in the Record in full, because they are interesting. Out yonder upon the Soo Canal, which he claims is the center of the tonnage universe, they had for the year 1914 a total foreign tonnage of 26,000,000. On the Atlantic seaboard we had 51,000,000 tons.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am near the end of my time. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman mean to say that there were only 26,000,000 tons of freight passing through the Soo Canal in 1914?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My figures are with reference to the foreign commerce on the Great Lakes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In 1913—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will put the figures in the Record. As to foreign tonnage the Atlantic ports are twice as strong as the Great Lakes, and as to values, sixteen times as much.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fishing Creek, N. C.: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I had no idea of referring to this, although it is among my notes, but it comes right after the paragraph which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] was so eloquently discussing, about the commerce upon the Atlantic coast. I am interested in this, and so is the committee, because the commerce at Fishing Creek amounts to 1,006 tons, of which 848 tons is timber hauled by the owners, leaving 248 tons the amount of commerce at this point. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is right in his statement in regard to the Soo Canal, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will find that the gentleman from Michigan is correct. The commerce passing through the Soo Canal in 1913, as shown by the Engineer's report, was something like 79,000,000 tons, according to my best recollection.

Of course, there is a large tonnage in Philadelphia. Philadelphia receives in this bill something like \$2,700,000, with the authorization, due to the urgent pressure brought by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], who looks after his constituents and does it well. Philadelphia is a large port; but when he objects, as he has objected upon this floor, to a limitation in the amount to be paid for dredging, he is attacking one of the fundamental objections to this bill, and you can not afford to go to the country with that. You do not want to needlessly waste money. No man on this floor should do that, and in all these dredging contracts we desire, as far as possible, to keep the cost down within limits, and that has been the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon]. Talk about Government ownership! There are a dozen great dredging contracts made for the Delaware River. There ought to be some limitation, if there be any question about what the profits are to be, and I believe that is a wise rule.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who made the statement in regard to the waterway canal, said there was no canal in this country, outside of the deep-water canals, bringing any profit upon any investment. He referred, among others, to the Hennepin Canal. The gentleman is correct, so far as I can ascertain. Out of the 4,400 miles of canals that were in existence in the United States, 2,400 miles, or over 50 per cent of the canal mileage in this country, has been abandoned, and there is to-day no independent canal that is making 2 per cent profit upon the actual investment. Take the Delaware Canal, which the gentleman speaks about so frequently. The stock was worth nothing and the bonds were worth only 50 cents on a dollar before the proposition came for the Government to buy it. Take the canal, the Beaufort and Norfolk project; it was bought for \$500,000. It was not a profit-making concern, but unprofitable. The Government took it, and we have been endeavoring to conduct some business on it, and we have spent over \$1,000,000 already in that effort. The expenditure of \$5,400,000 is proposed in this project, and we have developed a little over 200,000 tons of traffic. The gentleman says \$40,000,000 will be paid for all this waterway. Why, as I understand it, it runs from \$100,000,000 to \$300,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is entirely in error. There is no justification for any such statement as that.

Mr. FREAR. If I am wrong, I will be glad to be corrected. It will be over \$20,000,000 for this little 13-mile Delaware Canal the gentleman desires. That is the Agnus report. It will be far more than that for the canal across the State of New Jersey.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Agnus report recommends the construction of a 35-foot canal, and estimates the cost at \$21,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. That is right. I said \$20,000,000; \$21,000,000 is the right amount.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The cost along the line would be gauged according to the depth.



Mr. FREAR. Let me say to the gentleman that if it is to be used for preparedness, you have got to put that amount of money into it.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than five minutes, not on the bill but to answer a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on last Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes, not upon the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, on last Monday the Judiciary Committee reported a bill providing for the transfer of Charleston County, Mo., from the eastern district of Missouri to the western district of Missouri. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] had some remarks to make about the form of the bill, and I stated as follows:

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was considered that question was raised, as to whether it might not be the better practice to set out the statute as it would read when amended, and some of us were informed that on another occasion when that had been done the Senate changed the practice and reported back the bill in some such form as this.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's information was incorrect. There has been no such case. There has been no case where the House passed a bill amending an original section, where the Senate struck that out and inserted a mere change of the law.

Mr. Chairman, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1915, on page 3820, it appears that the House considered a bill for the transfer of two counties in Arkansas, and that bill set out the section as it would appear when amended. The House passed the bill. The bill was called up in the Senate, and on page 5350 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on March 3, it appears that the bill was reported back to the Senate with the recommendation to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a bill in the same form as that which we passed last Monday. That amendment was agreed to in the Senate and the bill was returned to the House, and the bill as amended by the Senate was agreed to by the House and passed, and it will be found on page 5490 of the RECORD. I make this statement because the gentleman from Illinois is usually correct and his statement might be taken as proof of the fact.

Mr. MANN. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Missouri for the correction.

Mr. IGOE. I thought the gentleman would be, and I wanted to put it in the RECORD so that the Judiciary Committee might at least stand right before the House.

Mr. MANN. That was one case of bad practice which slipped by me.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$83,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Amend page 10 by striking out lines 16 and 17.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because the improvement and maintenance are both joined together, and it seems to me there is a great waste on that river, which has so far cost the Government over \$7,000,000. I am referring to the upper part of the river, which gets \$83,000. The project is an 8-foot project. The engineer says that he did not believe that an 8-foot navigation was necessary, but thought that 4 or 5 feet would be sufficient. The board and Mr. McKenzie, chief, approved of a modification of the channel from 8 feet to 4 feet and from \$1,350,000 to \$615,000. The river and harbor act of 1910 provided for 8-foot navigation, to cost \$615,000, with \$85,000 maintenance. The report of 1914 says that since the adoption of the present project closer investigation of conditions, and so forth, render it necessary to increase the estimate from \$615,000 to \$1,031,000; the project is about 60 per cent completed.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that Congress has been unfair in that it reduced the appropriation \$600,000, but left the requirement for an 8-foot channel. The Army engineers say it is a mistake in estimates, because Congress insists on the original depth but cuts the appropriation one-half.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MANN. This is to complete an improvement?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; but it is an 8-foot channel where Army engineers said that 4 feet would be enough. The House took away half of the original appropriation and left the project requiring an 8-foot channel.

Mr. MANN. If we started in to finish an 8-foot channel to cost \$600,000 or \$1,300,000, whatever it is, is it not wise to complete it if it will only cost \$50,000 or \$60,000?

Mr. FREAR. That would be true if the commerce afforded any reason for it, but commerce is practically, the most of it, 4 miles above Wilmington. Practically three-quarters of the

commerce comes from just above the city. The fault lies originally with Congress, for they took away from the Army engineer's estimate about one-half of the appropriation and then insisted on an 8-foot channel. It shows the effect of legislating in a haphazard fashion and the waste it occasions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Charleston Harbor, S. C.: Completing improvement of the 28-foot channel to the sea, \$70,000; for maintenance of improvement of Ashley River, \$10,000; in all, \$80,000.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting on page 11, between lines 4 and 5, the following: "Cooper River, S. C.: For improvement of channel from the harbor of Charleston to the naval reservation, so as to provide a channel 30 feet deep at all stages and 600 feet wide in straight stretches, increasing to a thousand feet at bends, in accordance with report published in House Document 947, Sixty-first Congress, second session, \$175,000."

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, as this is an important amendment, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of providing an adequate channel from the harbor of Charleston to the navy yard, located 6 miles above the city of Charleston. There is an anomalous situation down there, which has been knocking at the doors of Congress ever since the Charleston yard was located. In 1900 when the Roger Board recommended the removal of the yard from Beaufort, S. C., to Charleston, it made the following statement in its report:

To reach the site selected on the Cooper River it would be desirable to remove the shoal at the head of Drum Island and also a lump in the bend of the river above, neither of which involves any difficulty or much expense.

Ever since the yard was located at Charleston, there has been a crying need to remove two lumps from the river so that it will allow the battleships to proceed to the yard. To-day any battleship in the Navy can enter the splendid harbor of Charleston. The whole United States fleet can be mobilized in that deep and commodious harbor, but when it comes to going from the harbor to the navy yard, which is distant 6 miles, there are two lumps in the river which carry only 26 feet of water and a width of 150 feet. To-day it is almost impossible for any naval officer to take a battleship from the harbor to the yard. He has 26 feet under his ship at mean low tide and 5 feet rise, but he has only 150 feet in width and at the bends of the river it is impossible to turn a battleship which may be four or five hundred feet long so as to avoid grounding her. The navy yard at Charleston has a dock which can accommodate any battleship in the Navy which has a length of not more than 545 feet. It is the largest navy yard south of Hatteras. There are six navy yards north of Hatteras and only three south of Hatteras.

The water on the sill over the dock at Charleston is 31 feet, as much as there is over any sill with the exception of the New York yard. The bar at Charleston will allow any ship to come into the harbor, and any ship drawing not more than 31 feet can be docked in that dock. Yet we have the situation to-day where a ship can not get to the navy yard because of two little shoals up this river. In 1900 there was a provision in the river and harbor bill calling for a survey of this river. A survey was made and a report made to Congress, in which it is stated:

Cooper River in its present condition will accommodate present or reasonably prospective commerce and needs no improvement, therefore, but considering the needs of the Navy Department some improvement is desirable. From correspondence herewith it appears that the needs of the Navy Department would be met by dredging a channel 30 feet deep at all stages, and 600 feet wide in straight reaches, increasing to 1,000 feet at bends up to the naval station, passing to the east of Drum Island, which is estimated by the district officer to cost \$175,000.

This project has been before Congress since 1910, and has been turned down by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors year after year, because it was a naval proposition and the committee only considered the commercial needs of river improvement. In 1914 there was a resurvey of this river made for the purpose of ascertaining the commerce on the river, and a report was made to Congress in which it was stated that the commerce of the river had increased from \$400,000 to \$5,000,000, and this year a statement was made to the committee at a hearing held on the deepening of the harbor entrance to 30 feet that the commerce had increased since 1914 from \$5,000,000

to nearly \$12,000,000. We have a situation down there to-day where all of the ships of the Navy can gather in the harbor and mobilize there and any ship in the Navy can dock at that yard which is not more than 545 feet in length and does not draw more than 31 feet of water, but she can not go up the river to the yard because of two small shoals, where the river is not wide enough. We have ample water in front of the yard. At every other place in this river there is from 30 to 50 feet of water, and yet we have been unable to get any relief from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, because it is a naval proposition, and we can not get any relief from the Naval Committee because it does not deal with harbor propositions. We are going into the question of national defense—

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman states that it is a naval proposition. Is not the reason that he can not get relief from the River and Harbor Committee the fact that it is a new project?

Mr. WHALEY. Oh, that was after 1914.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am talking of the present time.

Mr. WHALEY. At the present time the objection to it is that it is a new project and it was not put in the bill on that account this year. Last year the same objection was made, namely, that it was a new project.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Can the gentleman inform us how much money was expended there for the navy yard?

Mr. WHALEY. The Navy Department has spent \$5,000,000 at the navy yard.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And they have built a yard there although they did not have accommodations to go to the yard?

Mr. WHALEY. At that time the battleships were drawing 26 and 27 feet of water, which would have given enough water to go up to the yard at high tide only.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Did they go up?

Mr. WHALEY. They have had several up there. The *Olympia* is up there to-day, but she is a short ship.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Has the \$5,000,000 investment at the Charleston Navy Yard been justified in any manner?

Mr. WHALEY. More than justified. They have got four-hundred employees working there to-day, and have been working continuously for two years, and the Secretary of the Navy has written letters commending the yard for its efficient and splendid work.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What I am driving at is to find out in what way it has been useful as a navy yard for the accommodation of battleships?

Mr. WHALEY. The only battleship there is the *Olympia*.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. That is the only one?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And you have sufficient depth of water at the yard, but you can not get to the yard on account of this channel?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And you want to deepen it to 30 feet and widen it to 600 feet, and at certain points in the river to 1,000 feet?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And the objection is made that you can not have it because it is a new project?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How much will it cost?

Mr. WHALEY. It will cost \$175,000; but there is nothing for maintenance. The report of the engineers is that there will be nothing at all for maintenance. It is a flat-footed proposition of \$175,000 to widen and deepen the river to the yard.

Now, I want the House to understand that this is no attempt on my part to inject any pork-barrel business into this legislation, but it is a worthy, fair, and just project that has been demanded by the Navy Department for years for the purpose of allowing the use of the yard for battleships.

Mr. Chairman, when I found that the New York item was going into this bill, and that there was to be an exception made so far as new projects were concerned, and that the committee was going to take into consideration the needs of the Navy, carrying out the lines of national defense as urged by the Executive, I also got busy. I saw the Executive and I called his attention to this matter. He stated to me that he would send for the chairman of the committee. The other day when the chairman was making his splendid statement in reference to this bill I asked him if he had seen him, and he

admitted that he had been seen by the Chief Executive and he had referred him to the naval officers.

I want to read to this House a letter addressed by Admiral Benson to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, dated February 25, 1916:

FEBRUARY 25, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: Since our conversation a few days ago in regard to the channel leading from the city of Charleston, S. C., to the navy yard, I find, on more careful investigation, that the dry dock at that yard will comfortably accommodate any of our vessels up to and including the *Utah* and *Florida* class.

As I told you at that time, I had taken the *Utah* into Charleston Harbor, and the least water found in the main channel was 33 feet. Following out the same line of argument that I used in regard to the channel in the East River leading from the southward to the New York Navy Yard, I feel that I should correct the error under which I was laboring the other day, and say that I believe the channel leading from the city of Charleston up to the navy yard should be so improved as to make it possible to accommodate any battleship in our Navy that could use that dry dock.

At the time the conversation took place the other day I was under the impression that this dock could not accommodate any except our very oldest battleships, and was really a little in doubt in regard to that. I am sorry that I should have been in ignorance of this point, but having discovered that I was ignorant, and consequently arguing on a wrong basis, I think it only proper that I should correct the mistake that I made at that time.

As you remember, when before the full Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the direct question was asked if I thought we should have a first-class navy yard south of Hatteras, and in answer to that question I stated "yes." I am still of that opinion, and as Charleston is the only one that fills that condition at present, I feel that this is also another argument why I should correct the wrong impression that I was laboring under during the conversation in question.

I feel particularly impelled to make this correction as in case of any international complication there should be any naval engagements south of Hatteras, it would be of vital importance to be able to use all the facilities that the Charleston yard offers, and to this extent I consider that this improvement should be considered in the nature of an urgent one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to read a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, dated March 3, 1916:

MARCH 3, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: While in Charleston, S. C., last December there were a number of our battleships in the harbor, and I was very much impressed with the necessity of deepening the channel leading from the harbor to the dry dock at the Charleston yard.

As you doubtless are aware, the dry dock at Charleston is sufficiently large to accommodate vessels of the *Utah-Florida* class and possibly the *Arkansas-Wyoming* class.

The cost, as I understand it, of deepening this channel is comparatively small, and as this dock is the only one of anywhere near its size south of Hatteras, it should be available for use in case of accident to any of our vessels off our southern coast. Due not only to the long distance but also to the stormy weather that might be encountered off Hatteras and to the northward, it might be of vital importance to take an injured vessel into a dock south of Hatteras.

In view of the efforts we are making along the line of preparedness, I consider the deepening of the channel leading from Charleston Harbor to the navy yard at that place of great importance and of an urgent character, and I recommend that action be taken toward its early accomplishment.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

HON. S. M. SPARKMAN, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single naval officer with whom I have ever talked or ever heard speak of the next naval fight, should this country get into war, who has not stated that it will take place in the Caribbean Sea. The Norfolk Navy Yard, which is north of Hatteras, is 1,500 miles from the Caribbean Sea. The Norfolk Navy Yard is 500 miles from the Charleston Navy Yard. If we have a fight in the Caribbean Sea, doubtless we will win that fight, but our battleships are not going unscathed. They are going to be injured, and will have to go 500 miles before they can get into a dry dock. If this project is adopted and these shoals are removed from this river, a ship can be taken into the Charleston Navy Yard and save 500 miles before it could get to the Norfolk yard, and avoid going around Cape Hatteras, which is considered "the graveyard of the Atlantic."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEY. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As I recall the depth of the water at the entrance of your harbor it is 28 feet.

Mr. WHALEY. It is 28½ feet, with a rise of 5½ feet at high tide, making the least depth at high water 33 feet.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have always thought that that was one harbor that ought to be assisted. I am glad to hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEY. I will.



Mr. MADDEN. How long is it estimated it will take to deepen this channel?

Mr. WHALEY. It can be done in six months. There are two Government dredges in Charleston Harbor now, and have been idle for two years.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the character of the work in the navy yard now?

Mr. WHALEY. They are repairing the *Olympia*, putting up building ways, which will build a boat 400 feet long. There is a torpedo squadron down there, and they are building tugs and ferryboats there to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. What facilities would a dry dock have for repairing ordinary-sized battleships if they were able to get into the yard?

Mr. WHALEY. There is every facility in the yard.

Mr. MADDEN. How about the docks?

Mr. WHALEY. It can accommodate any battleship 545 feet long.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to correct the gentleman in regard to the depth. The difference between him and myself is not very much. The engineers' report for the fiscal year is that the depth is 28 feet, with water at mean low tide over the bar and into Charleston Harbor.

Mr. WHALEY. It is 28½ feet, and every pilot in the harbor knows that it is 28½ feet, with a 5-foot rise at high tide. The report the gentleman is referring to is a report made in 1910.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the 1915 report.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I not ask if we are not carrying in this bill here an appropriation for \$70,000 in order to get 28-foot projects not yet completed?

Mr. WHALEY. Twenty-eight is there to-day.

Mr. TREADWAY. What is this item here for?

Mr. WHALEY. For widening the channel. It is a continuing project.

Mr. TREADWAY. The phraseology of the bill says "to complete."

Mr. WHALEY. To-day there is 500 feet width, and to carry out the project it is necessary to have 600 feet width of channel to the harbor.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have forgotten, and I would like to ask what is the size of the dock there?

Mr. WHALEY. It is 566 feet 7½ inches, and it is 31 feet 1½ inches over the sill, according to the Navy Yearbook, 1915, page 544.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What is the width?

Mr. WHALEY. It is 134 feet wide, and will accommodate a vessel of 101 feet beam.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman that the report shows that it is 504 feet in length.

Mr. WHALEY. It will carry a ship 545 feet in length, but the width of the dock is 134 feet. It will only carry a vessel with 101 feet beam, because you have to have a space on each side, the same as you have to have a space at each end.

Mr. Chairman, when the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee was making a statement on this bill, I am glad to say, he was fair enough to set forth the Charleston proposition alongside of the New York proposition. I want to read to this House what the chairman of the committee said about these two propositions.

I read:

The only other item that presents conditions at all similar is the navy yard at Charleston, S. C., the difference between it and the yard at New York being one of degree in the matter of importance.

Yes; "in degree," in that the New York navy yard is a larger yard and a construction yard. The Charleston yard is a repair yard, and is becoming a construction yard, and it will take \$750,000 for New York and \$175,000 for Charleston.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. WHALEY. May I have three minutes, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEY. Besides that, I read further:

While the Charleston yard has a dry dock that can accommodate vessels drawing more than 30 feet, unlike the Brooklyn Navy Yard, it has no shipbuilding plant, its equipment being only for repairs. I believe, however, that a shipbuilding slip is soon to be located there, but when completed it will only accommodate, so I am advised, tugs, and possibly torpedo boats.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to state to this House that those shipbuilding piers will accommodate any collier or naval auxiliary about 470 feet long and about 4,000 tons. They will accom-

modate any torpedo boat 375 feet long. That is the largest type we have in the Navy to-day. The chairman went on to say:

Like the New York Navy Yard, however, the channel leading to the Charleston yard is of less depth than are the slips or dry docks. While the latter can accommodate vessels of 30 feet draft, the former only has an available depth of 26 feet.

Mr. Chairman, we have this situation down there: A battleship can enter the harbor at Charleston and can anchor anywhere in the harbor, and yet if you want to take it to the dry dock, which has 31 feet of water on its sill, it is impossible to take it there now, because there are two little mud shoals that need to be dredged out to allow these ships to get into dry dock. If we increase our Navy, a repair yard like this yard will relieve these other yards up north of the repair work on these smaller ships.

There is no reason in the world why the Government should have a \$5,000,000 plant up the river and be unable to get to it because Congress is bickering as to whether the Rivers and Harbors Committee should make the appropriation or the Naval Committee should make the appropriation. What I want this House to do is to allow the battleships that enter the harbor to go up to the yard and the ships that are constructed at the yard to go out to sea.

I hope the Government will adopt this project, because it is in line with the policy of national defense, and the appropriation necessary to do it is infinitesimal in comparison to the benefits to be gained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is an amendment to the amendment pending, as offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the amendment the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended until the local authorities shall provide sufficient public terminal facilities in Charleston, to be approved by the Secretary of War."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have a good deal of sympathy for the cause as presented to this House by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY]. I feel that line of sympathy because the relation between the two propositions, that of Boston and that of Charleston, is so similar that I feel a brotherly regard toward the proposition which he presents.

But I want to suggest this to the House: You voted out a few days ago an amendment offered in behalf of Boston Harbor, very largely looking to the same end as that which the gentleman from South Carolina is looking for in this, namely, better facilities to reach a dry dock and a navy yard. Now, his amendment has run the whole course of an effort to secure consideration from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors as a commercial proposition, and when the Committee on Rivers and Harbors voted not to put in new projects, it naturally turned down the Charleston proposition along with the others. The gentleman is disguising the fact that he is working in behalf of the commercial proposition in Charleston under the guise of possible "preparedness." In substantiation of that statement I want to refer to the hearings held by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on January 14 last.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. WHALEY. Was not that hearing based largely on adding to the depth of Charleston Harbor from 28 feet to 30 feet? This is a different proposition. This is improving the Cooper River above the city of Charleston. The hearings were had on the subject of deepening the harbor channel to 30 feet from 28 feet.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is in order to get to a new town that the gentleman's people are laying out there.

Mr. WHALEY. This does not reach the new town. It misses the new town by a mile and a half, as the gentleman will find if he reads the hearing carefully.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to be corrected if I am in error in my statement, because the gentleman knows the geography of that region better than I do. But, so far as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is concerned, there was nothing before that committee except the hearing of January 14. Is that correct? I would like the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to pass upon that statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is nothing whatever before that Committee on Rivers and Harbors on this subject except that hearing on January 14. Now, we are considering the river and

harbor bill, and if the gentleman's project is what it purports to be, and if it has to do with preparedness, he should take it to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have no doubt he will take it there ultimately. If he is turned down here, he will take it before the Committee on Naval Affairs. The gentleman ought to be fair to the House. He is demanding the incorporation in this bill of an amendment that has nothing to do with the river and harbor bill, when the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has in no sense considered it. He ought to be fair in that attitude toward the House.

Mr. WHALEY. Will the gentleman look at page 127 of the report of the River and Harbor Committee?

Mr. TREADWAY. I call the gentleman's attention to several items in this report. The first is the testimony of Mr. Rhett. Mr. Rhett was introduced to the committee as president of the chamber of commerce and mayor of the city of Charleston. His very first statement is—

Inasmuch as this is a commercial proposition and there has gone abroad an impression that the commercial business of Charleston is not a particularly prosperous one, I am going to ask you to give me five minutes for a commercial review in order that you may understand the conditions actually existing there.

Then he goes on as to terminals, and states that a terminal company was organized which bought up a large portion of the water front and then failed. It was bought by the Atlantic Coast Line, which subsequently associated the Southern Railway in the ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more. I was interrupted by a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, later on he proceeds, Mr. Chairman, as follows:

Recently we have undertaken to build a new town above Charleston, which is on the point of a narrow peninsula, just like New York.

That is a land-development project, very plainly. Then he says:

The Seaboard Air Line have put in terminals costing over \$300,000. Two private enterprises have put up cotton compresses and terminal piers, and so on, as you will see on this map. Four steamship lines have come into Charleston recently. The American-Hawaiian Line, with its very large ships, makes Charleston the only point of distribution on the South Atlantic coast. The Morgan Line, from Galveston, also makes Charleston its southern distributing port.

Further on he says:

We have no municipal terminals to speak of, but all privately owned by steamship companies, railroads, individuals, and corporations. The complaint was that the railroads would not build up their wharves, and there was not an adequate amount of berths for ships. That was the reason why we insisted that something had to be done. The city has an option on 850 feet of water front, but as yet nothing has been done toward its development.

Well and good. If they want to take Government money to improve a condition existing in Charleston Harbor, under the guise of a river and harbor bill, they certainly ought to comply with the very first requirement that the Rivers and Harbors Committee makes in every instance, namely, that there shall be public municipal terminals at the point where the appropriation is to be expended. Whether or not this particular improvement of the gentleman from South Carolina applies directly to the project we have before us I can not say, nevertheless my amendment is just as applicable to his amendment as it would be if we were considering the question of getting into Charleston, because it is just as much a commercial proposition as it is a naval proposition; and if it is not, it ought not to be here. If it is, as he says, solely a naval proposition, let it go into the naval bill when that comes along.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Navy appeared before the Naval Committee and called attention to the necessity of this improvement, as also did Admiral Benson, chief of operations. The situation is this: The navy yard is about six miles up the river from the harbor. These two shoals are outside of the limit of the navy yard proper, and between the navy yard and the regular harbor. For that reason it comes under the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee; but the Government has the yard above there, and in order that that yard may be as fully and completely useful and serviceable as it should be, in order that it may make the most out of the \$5,000,000 now invested in this yard, these shoals should be removed. The cost of removing them would be about \$175,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It really does not make any difference whether it comes through one committee or the other. The people have to pay it, and what difference does it make which committee reports it?

Mr. PADGETT. That is true. I was going to say that in view of the necessity for it, I think the quibble between the two committees is uncalled for. It is clear that the Naval Committee strictly would not have jurisdiction, and we called the attention of the Secretary to that fact; because the Naval bill carries appropriations for dredging and improvements in the yard and the waters adjacent to the yard, comprised and embraced in the navy yard proper. If it were there, we could deal with it, but as it is outside of the limits of the yard, and intercepts the travel between the yard and the open sea down in the river, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. But the navy yard being there, and being a Government institution, and a very important and necessary one, that is a strong argument which addresses itself to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and also to the Committee of the Whole, and to the House and to the Congress, why it should be taken hold of, and why this small appropriation should be made to take away these shoals that intercept the travel between the sea and the yard.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman please inform the House when the Committee on Naval Affairs first learned of this trouble down in Charleston, and first learned that our dreadnaughts and large vessels could not get into the dock there?

Mr. PADGETT. The first time it was brought before the committee officially, as I now remember, was during the present session of Congress. I have heard of it time and again, but I do not think it has been officially brought to the attention of the committee before this.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman please state why some representative of the Committee on Naval Affairs did not appear before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors while it was in session for two months or more.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I can give the gentleman the best kind of a reason. We were having business of our own, meeting every morning at 10.30 and holding until between 5 and 6 in the afternoon, and there were gentlemen representing the Navy who did appear. The Secretary of the Navy, and Admiral Benson, Chief of the Bureau of Operations, did appear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman please inform the House why Admiral Benson or the Secretary of the Navy were not requested by the Committee on Naval Affairs to make a recommendation that this improvement be included in the river and harbor bill by the River and Harbor Committee?

Mr. PADGETT. They did make it; they made it to us and made it to the other committee, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that there is any relevancy in it, but there was no application made to the River and Harbor Committee until we had finished and reported this bill to the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the date of it, but they did come before the River and Harbor Committee. Now, the question has been raised about the size of the dock. I have the official figures here.

Mr. SWITZER. Just one more question. Does the gentleman understand that this project was recommended for a depth of only 30 feet?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember whether it is 28½ or 30 feet.

Mr. SWITZER. Now, is it not a fact that the General Board of the Navy state that you should have at least 40 feet; that a crippled battleship will require 35, 36, 37, or 38 feet to bring it into one of these docks in order to make it effective again?

Mr. PADGETT. If the depth were 30 feet, with a 5-foot tide, that would make 35 feet at high tide. But let me state frankly to the gentleman that the largest dreadnaught could not be accommodated at Charleston. Let us not labor under any mistake. It takes ships of the *Utah* class and the *Florida* class, and from that size down; but for the classes above that it would not accommodate them.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want to find out how long we are going to have ships of the *Utah* and *Florida* class. Will they be with us for some years to come?



Mr. PADGETT. Yes, indeed. They are very valuable ships. The *Utah*, if I remember, is about 22,000 tons displacement. I have the exact figures here, if it were necessary to look them up.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I merely wanted to be advised about it.

Mr. PADGETT. It is one of our dreadnaughts, but not one of the largest ones. I think the draft is about 28 or 28½ feet. The depth of one of the largest dreadnaughts is not a great deal more, but it is the dock situation which is to be considered.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. There is no danger of their becoming antiquated for many years to come?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman looks upon this investment of \$170,000 as making available the \$5,000,000 investment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; our committee has not assumed to report it out, but advised the gentleman to go to the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. One minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If this is in the interest of the Navy, why did not Admiral Benson say something about it before our committee—why did you not get some instructions from the White House about it?

Mr. PADGETT. We thought that the committee, on a plain proposition like this, could take care of it without direction from the White House.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, we could, but you could not on that side.

Mr. PADGETT. Then we will come and get you to help us out. Now, Mr. Chairman, referring to the dock, the length is 566 feet; the length of the forehead to the outer sill is 548 feet; width and coping, 134 feet; width from the top of the keel blocks, 96 feet and 2 inches; width at the coping, 113 feet and the fraction of an inch; governing width, 6 feet above the sill, 101 feet 11½ inches; depth at mean high water to sill, 34 feet 1½ inches.

So you see that it is a dock capable of dealing with, not the largest ships because they are too long for it, but it is for the type of ships of the *Utah* and the *Florida* and ships of that size and below it; and, as I say, the *Utah* has a displacement of 22,000 tons.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in this case presents a business proposition. The Government has invested \$5,000,000 in a navy yard at Charleston, S. C., and the facts presented to the committee this morning show that at the entrance of the channel there is a certain depth of water, while at the other end of the channel where the navy yard is situated there is another depth of water, something like 30 feet, but in between the two places are certain shoals or bumps which reduce the depth to 26 feet. The amendment proposed undertakes to deepen the channel where the bumps are, so that you will have a uniform channel that will permit the entrance of larger ships to the navy yard. As I say, the Government investment is \$5,000,000. As the situation stands now the investment is not bringing its fullest return, because it is impossible under the situation to utilize the navy yard to its fullest extent. We are called upon here this morning to invest another \$170,000 to make available to the fullest extent the investment of \$5,000,000 which we have made. That seems to be a good business proposition from the standpoint of a pure business principle. Now, more than that, it seems that all the testimony in this case agrees with that proposition.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Where was the testimony submitted; was any of it before the Rivers and Harbors Committee?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, my colleague Mr. WHALEY, to answer that.

Mr. WHALEY. If the gentleman will look on page 29 of the hearings before the River and Harbor Committee, he will find the following:

Mr. WHALEY. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, for the hearing. I would not say anything to the committee at length, but I just wanted to call attention to this Cooper River project. That has only two spots in it that need dredging out to make the bar 28 feet, and that would give us a continuous passage up the river. Up the river to-day you have 26 feet, and it is not wide enough, but the naval officers go all over this country saying we have only 22 feet. We have 26 feet. It is not wide enough to allow a battleship to come up here. Therefore the river has been damned with 22 feet of water. I want the committee to take up particularly that Cooper River project and look into it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a new project?

Mr. WHALEY. That is a new project.

The CHAIRMAN. We have not yet determined to take up new projects. If we do, of course, we will look into this proposition.

But you never looked into it.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he considers that very strong testimony before the River and Harbor Committee in behalf of the project that he is advocating, and also whether he himself does not say that the project is a new one, and consequently the committee having voted not to adopt any new projects, he thinks he is rightfully before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in that respect?

Mr. WHALEY. I will leave it to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts whether I have not been before that committee time and again to urge this thing.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not deny that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in respect to the testimony that I intended to bring before the committee, it does not deal with that feature. I am going to call attention to what took place upon the floor of the House this morning in Committee of the Whole. We have had the testimony of Admiral Benson quoted that the deepening of the channel is an urgent necessity in case of war. We have the statement of Secretary Daniels that the deepening of the channel was an absolute necessity to the fullest development of the Charleston Navy Yard and the fullest utility of it in time of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Now, we have had the testimony likewise of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, supporting this proposition, and saying that it is an absolute necessity both in time of war and in time of peace. The deepening of this channel is also referred to by the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in his opening statement on this bill, in which he says that this proposition differs from the New York proposition only in point of degree; namely, that they are both urgent and both necessary, the difference being that one is a big proposition and the other an apparently small proposition.

It seems to me that we have been shuttlecocking this Charleston proposition between the Naval Committee and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. We are asking to spend \$170,000 to do an urgent piece of work. That \$170,000 must come from the Treasury, and it makes absolutely no difference from the standpoint of the taxpayer whether the expenditure is authorized by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or by my friend from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The question for this committee is, Is it an urgent necessity, is it a good investment, is it a good proposition? If it is, you must answer that this Committee of the Whole, representing both the Naval Committee and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, will take the bit in its own teeth and do what seems to be a businesslike and reasonable thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for one minute as I desire to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, agreeing with what the gentleman says as to the urgent necessity for making the proper provision for entering the navy yard at once available for the ships of the Navy, does the gentleman not think it should apply not only to his yard but to the yard at Charlestown, Mass.?

Mr. LEVER. I confess to the gentleman that I am not familiar with his proposition, and I would not care to discuss it.

Mr. TAGUE. They are both navy yards, and the gentleman is urging one, and why not the other?

Mr. LEVER. I am informed that the gentleman has 35 feet of water whereas Charleston has only 26 feet, under present conditions.

Mr. TREADWAY. But we have very much larger accommodations there.

Mr. LEVER. I am not familiar with the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY] sounds good to me, and I intend to support the amendment. I would support an amendment to improve the channel to any useful navy yard in the United States. I believe that every year Congress is going



to build more and more of its naval craft in Government establishments and have fewer of them built in private establishments, and I am interested in seeing this amendment adopted for this reason. If it is not adopted, then when an amendment is offered to the naval appropriation bill when it comes up to build a certain vessel in a Government plant, the Charleston Navy Yard, say, some one will get up in opposing that amendment and say that one of these large ships can not get into that yard. For that reason I am in favor of having this channel dredged out so that that argument can not be made when the proposition comes up to have the Government build its own ships. I believe that appropriations for this kind of preparedness are the best kind that can be made, and that the public will get a larger amount of value out of appropriations of this kind than out of any kind, in keeping the Government establishments, particularly the arsenals and the navy yards, in shape, so that the Government can manufacture its own munitions and ships of every character. Therefore I shall support this amendment. [Applause.]

I shall also support the amendments of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], providing that no part of the large sums being appropriated for river and harbor improvement shall be spent by the awarding of contracts to private dredging firms whose bids are more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimates for the same work when done by the Government itself. The river and harbor bill is already much criticized as a "pork-barrel" proposition, but if the people ever find out that the Rivers and Harbors Committee is opposing amendments of this kind, river-improvement legislation will receive a blacker eye than it now has. I am in favor of legitimate waterway projects, but am not in favor of paying private firms more than 25 per cent in excess of the price at which the Government can itself do the work for. The improvement of rivers and harbors is to be a permanent policy of the Government, and therefore the Government is justified in doing a very large percentage of the work itself in the event private concerns ask extortionate prices.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I favored the taking on of new projects, and if the gentleman's project at Charleston has been suppressed or shut off, he has no one to blame but the majority of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I was in sympathy with his project, and I am in sympathy with all projects that are in the interest of commerce, and that is practically what this project is. This is just the same as the New York project, which was carried in the bill as an exception to the rule. That carries 45,000,000 tons of commerce a year, and that is the reason it was pressed before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the reason it was kept in the bill. But the River and Harbor Committee having adopted this rule not to take on new projects, and making but one exception, in the case of New York, that being the metropolis of the Nation, now, every time some one gets up and says that a proposition is in the interest of preparedness, although we know that the underlying reason is that it is in the interest of commerce, practically and solely, are we going to put it into the bill and load it down with that sort of propositions that have had no consideration, practically, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors? The argument is that it is in the interest of preparedness. If this is in the interest of preparedness, and the Committee on Naval Affairs knew this improvement should be made, why did they not have before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors Admiral Benson or the Secretary of the Navy or some representative of the Navy, giving us some testimony on which we could rely and form some sort of judgment and conclusion, showing to us satisfactorily that this was vital to the Nation's defense?

Does any member of this committee believe to-day that if such testimony had been submitted to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that committee would not have reported that project in the bill or in a separate bill; and if it had done the latter, does anyone believe that it would not have gone through this House without a dissenting vote? No, Mr. Chairman. This is all an afterthought and afterconsideration. The President, of course, is urged, just as he was urged in the New York proposition. If the gentleman has a letter from the President, he has not produced it. I believe he did say that the President had been seen. It seems also that the Committee on Naval Affairs has been seen and are appearing here to-day, although in our two months' consideration of this bill no such proposition came before us to deepen the channel at Charleston Harbor solely upon the ground of preparedness. The testimony will show that it was absolutely upon the ground and in the interest of commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I can not recommend to the House the adoption of the project presented in the amendment offered by the gentleman from

South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY]. Before I give my reasons for my objection to the amendment, however, I wish to do the gentleman the credit of saying that he has lost no opportunity at any time to present this matter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. In addition to the statement made before the committee at the hearings, to which attention has been called, he has spoken to me many times and urged the importance, from his viewpoint, of inserting this project in the bill, and I am sorry I can not see my way clear to accept the amendment, but for reasons I am now going to set forth I can not do so whatever this committee may do.

In the first place, there is no project before us that, in my judgment, ought to be adopted. In the bill of 1909 a survey was ordered for Cooper Creek on which the Charleston Navy Yard is located. A report as early as 1910 was furnished by the engineers with a favorable recommendation in so far as the use of the navy was concerned, but with a statement that it was not needed for commercial purposes.

That is the project mentioned in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina. The concluding paragraph of the chief's report is as follows:

I concur with the district officer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors that Cooper River, S. C., is worthy of improvement for naval purposes up to the naval station as indicated. While no estimate is submitted for maintenance, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is of the opinion that its cost will not be excessive, in which opinion I concur.

Now, when that was written there was no project for the improvement of the entrance to Charleston Harbor beyond 28 feet, nor is there any project for that purpose yet. Now it has been stated that the depth over the outer bar is 28½ feet, but the engineers in their latest report only report a depth of 28 feet.

Now, what would be the use, let me ask, of furnishing 30 feet inside to the navy yard with only 20 feet on the outer bar? The same suggestion would apply as was made awhile ago. A navy yard is put away up in a shallow stream and when it is once there they must have deep water to get to it. Now, if we deepened this creek to 30 feet the Navy officials will come and say, "You have given us 30 feet of water up to the navy yard, but we have only 28 feet on the outside. Now give us 30 feet from the outside into the harbor, and this though it may not be needed." That is the position in which we would be placed. Moreover, there is a tidal rise of 5 feet, so that a vessel carrying as much as 33 feet can come over the bar in the Charleston Harbor. Admiral Benson tells us that at least at one time he carried a vessel in there drawing 33 feet.

Now, they have, according to the report here, 26 feet of water up to the navy yard, through Cooper Creek. Add, then, 5 feet to that, and you have 31 feet of water, as much as is necessary to get to docks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, I made a mistake in my opening statement which I want to correct. I said something to the effect that the Charleston dock could accommodate vessels drawing 30 feet, maybe more. I want to correct that by reading from the report of 1910, the one to which I have already referred. The local engineer says:

The dry dock is capable of taking the largest ships now authorized, as the *Utah* and *Florida*. It is 570 feet long.

The report says that it can take ships 540 feet in length instead of 570, and I believe that is correct; that is, 570 feet long, 110 feet wide at the entrance, and 28.9 feet depth over the sill at mean low water.

Now, that is the extent of the draft of the vessel that can go over the sill, namely, 28.9 feet. So I believe that 28 feet would be as much as would be required until the plant is enlarged.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another project for the improvement of that channel. We referred the matter back to the board two or three years ago. We felt we could not adopt the old project as it was not in the interest of commerce. The Naval Committee would not do the work. It was within its jurisdiction; it was also within ours, but we did not think it of sufficient importance to commerce to undertake it. But later it was stated that perhaps a smaller project might be in the interest of commerce. It was said that up above there somewhere, above the navy yard, one or more industrial establishments had grown up, and we referred the matter back to the board for report as to these changed commercial conditions, and whether or not a modified project would be advisable in the



interests of commerce. They came back with a report for a 20-foot project to cost only \$14,000.

Now, since that report was made we have had no river and harbor bill with new projects in it. If it is worth anything, when we do undertake to adopt new projects, I for one shall be in favor of adopting that project or some modification thereof. But I have another suggestion to make that will meet the situation exactly, I think. We can—and it will be my purpose if this is not adopted here, and I do not see why it should be in view of what I have said—it will be my purpose to refer the matter again to the Board of Engineers and ask them to report upon a project for 28 feet, with an estimate as to the cost. I do not know what the cost for a 28-foot channel would be, and nobody else knows now, but a 28-foot channel, Mr. Chairman, is all that is needed at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want to get this clear in my mind. You say that 28 feet is all that is necessary. Now, on the other hand, they say 30 feet. Do you say 28 feet for commercial purposes as distinguished from 30 feet for naval purposes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. They do not need 28 feet for commercial purposes, but for the purposes of the Navy they do, in my opinion.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And this provides for 30 feet of water?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and they only have 28 feet over the outer bar.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. But this \$175,000 proposition will take care of that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and more too. What is the use of throwing away that much money?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes; but what I have in mind is the \$5,000,000 investment. What are you going to do with it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the argument, then; there is a \$5,000,000 investment there, and we must put in a lot of money because we have invested \$5,000,000. The moment they get 30 feet inside they will come back and say, "Give us 30 feet also for the outer bar; otherwise the 2 extra feet will be thrown away."

Mr. PADGETT. It would not be thrown away, because there is a great deal of travel from the navy yard down the river, because they do not want to be held up there until high tide.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has been said that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," and similarly we may say sufficient unto the day is the good thereof. Whenever we get 28 feet of water over the bar I will not object to 30 feet through Cooper Creek, if the Navy requires it; but with the 28 feet and the tidal rise we would get 33 feet, which would be ample.

It will only be eight months from the time this bill will become a law, if it does become a law—and I hope it may—until another bill is due, and certainly eight months is not long, and it will not take long to do the work. It is in evidence here that this whole project can be completed in six months. So that it should be finished by September of next year, long before the project in New York Harbor is likely to be completed.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is basing his whole statement on depth. This project of \$175,000 is not only a matter of depth, but it is a matter of widening out at the turn, so that battleships can make the turn to go in there. If you do not give us that a ship can not go in at all, even if you have 30 feet. If you had the tide and get 30 feet or 33 feet, you have not got the width, and the ship can not turn. This is to get those angles at the turns and make the requisite width.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, my statement covers the turns and everything else, including the angles of the 28-foot project. What do you want to throw away money for?

I did state the other day—and I have nothing to retract—that the only difference between this and New York Harbor was one of degree of importance and urgency. I was referring then to the matter of preparedness, and not to these minor details. I do not want to be understood as intending to convey the idea that these two projects were similar in all respects, because the engineers have estimated exactly what the New York project will cost, but no one has told us yet what a 28-foot project for Cooper Creek will cost.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors called attention to the fact that he believed we ought to have 28 feet up this river. I want to call the attention of the House to this fact, that there is 28½ feet of water over the bar, but the bar is 3 miles from the navy

yard. A ship could go over the bar at high tide, but after going over the bar it would have to wait 12 hours to go up the river on the next tide. The local engineer, under date of April 2, 1910, reported on this very question. Here is what he says:

The largest battleships can now cross the Charleston bar by entering at high water. \* \* \* The entrance channels are straight and easily navigated. The requirement that the ship shall enter at high water is not seriously detrimental; but it is believed that, having entered the harbor, they should be enabled to proceed from the deep water of the harbor up to the navy yard at any stage of the tide. And as curvature in the trace of the Cooper River channel is inevitable, it is believed that improvement should contemplate greater widths and depths than are available on the bar. Where the channel is straight it should be made 600 feet wide; but in the bends it should be made 1,000 feet wide, and it should be made 30 feet deep throughout.

Mr. Chairman, the object of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is to make two projects out of what is one project. Instead of getting it down to 30 feet, so that the ships can go up to the yard without waiting for the next tide, his idea is to make it 28 feet now, and later on make it 30 feet, instead of doing it all at once. We all know it is cheaper if you make it 30 feet at once than if you were to make two contracts of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to my amendment, his amendment should not be put in here. It is not put in here in good faith. It is offered under a misapprehension of the situation entirely. The committee was considering the deepening of Charleston Harbor to 30 feet, and the objection was made that there was no public wharf at the harbor of Charleston. This project is not for the harbor or the water front of Charleston, but for the removal of the shoals 3 miles up the river from Charleston.

There is ample water from Charleston Harbor up to the shoals, and after you pass those shoals there is again ample water around the navy yard. The whole object is to remove the shoals, so that battleships can get up to the yard, and so that the Government can use an institution which cost it \$5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WHALEY. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, yeas 41.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. WHALEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 34, yeas 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waccamaw River, N. C. and S. C.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$8,500.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to take this occasion to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY] on the fight that he has made for his item. I am gratified to see that he at least had the courage to come in on the floor of the House and make a fight for what he believed was a meritorious project, and I had wondered what was the matter with the gentlemen who represent the Norfolk yard, that nobody was here to present that matter. That is one of the great yards on the coast. Conditions there are exactly what they were at New York. Yet no one on that side of the House made any effort to take care of that navy yard. If I had known it was going to be passed without anybody offering an amendment for it, I would have offered it myself. My good friend from South Carolina, Mr. WHALEY, made just one mistake—

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. I do not see the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND], who represents the Norfolk district, but I may state as a fact, which the gentleman from Washington knows, that there is already a depth of 35 feet to the Norfolk Navy Yard, and that the pending project there simply seeks to widen the



channel, but not to deepen it, and to provide anchorage ground at other places.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hold in my hand the engineer's report as to Norfolk. It says:

NORFOLK CHANNEL.

The importance of this harbor is shown by the statistics given within, which indicate a total tonnage of about 22,000,000 tons, with a value of \$1,600,000,000. The district officer states that an idea of the number of vessels navigating this channel may be had from the large amount of commerce carried, and that it is a very frequent sight to see four vessels going in one direction or the other practically abreast in the channel. There have been a number of collisions in recent years, due, it is stated, to inadequate width. To handle this great commerce safely, as well as to provide for the needs of the navy yard, he believes the width of this channel should be increased. He proposes a width of 600 feet in the entrance channel up to the mouth of the Southern Branch, at an estimated cost of about \$560,000. In the Southern Branch, up to the lower part of the navy yard, it is impracticable to secure a width of 600 feet, and a width of 450 feet is recommended for this part of the channel. Along the lower part of the navy yard the width proposed is 600 feet, the same as below the mouth of the Southern Branch, while near the upper end of the navy yard it is practicable to secure a greater width, and as this is desired by the Navy Department for the proper handling of the large modern war vessels, it is proposed to increase the width here to 800 feet. This widening of the Southern Branch is estimated to cost about \$280,000, which makes the total estimate for widening the Norfolk Channel \$840,000. The district officer states that if the sum of \$130,000 left in hand from the dredging of the 400-foot channel may be applied to the present recommended work, the additional funds required will amount to \$710,000. The estimate for maintenance is \$15,000 annually.

Now, that is a more important project than they had in New York. The only thing at New York was that they could not get in through one particular channel at all stages of the tide. My distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY] simply made the mistake that down in South Carolina they are reliably Democratic. If they had a Tammany organization down there, and a son-in-law to handle the patronage, and somebody to placate—

Mr. SLOAN. A son-in-law of a present or a past régime?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Owing to the fact that I do not desire to say anything embarrassing to anyone present, I am not going to discuss the son-in-law proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman object to having the RECORD show that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] rose? [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. I may say that what defense I propose to present will be in behalf of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] needs no defense. He is always capable of taking care of himself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And so is his father-in-law, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if there had been a political situation down in South Carolina such as they had in New York, the distinguished gentleman who represents that district could not only have visited the White House and talked with the President, but he could have come back with a letter from the President's Secretary, and he would have got his project into the bill without any trouble whatever. That is the only difference there is between the two situations. As to the one at New York, there was an intimation from the Secretary of the President that the President wished the item included in the bill. That was sufficient for the Democratic side. If my distinguished friend from South Carolina, who presented the facts here very well indeed, instead of taking up so much of the time of the House had used a little more time up at the White House, if he had possessed a little more political influence, he might then have got his project into this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Santee, Wateree, and Congaree Rivers, S. C.: For maintenance of improvement, including the Estherville-Minim Creek Canal and the Congaree River as far up as the Gervais Street Bridge, Columbia, \$55,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this paragraph, lines 9 to 12, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the general debate a few days ago the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors [Mr. SPARKMAN] criticized me somewhat because I did not particularize what projects I was opposed to. It is not necessary to go into the details of all these various projects that any Member of the House may be opposed to, but here is one illustration that I think may be properly called

to the attention of the House, to show what we are asked to appropriate \$55,000 for in this bill.

The biggest thing about these three rivers is the name—the Santee, Wateree, and Congaree. You have got to twist your tongue a little to pronounce them. All three are given in one lump project, so we do not know where the money is going to be used. But here is what the engineers say about the Santee:

Its bar entrance was narrow, crooked, and shifting, and so situated as to be very difficult and expensive to improve. It had less than 5 feet of depth at low water. The river was navigated by several small steamers drawing less than 4 feet.

This is another project covered by my general criticisms in my minority report against the rivers and harbors bill. This report was adopted in 1881. That is a good while ago to be keeping up something if the local conditions are entirely different from what they were when the project was adopted.

The operations and results prior to this fiscal year were a passage 30 feet wide and 3 feet deep at high water through Mosquito Creek. It does not say what it would be at low water. At high water it is 3 feet deep. The entire river has been snagged; total amount expended, \$272,245.74.

Operations and results during the present fiscal year. The work during the year consisted in snagging the upper end of the river, miles 120 to 143, and there were removed 2,405 obstructions and 195 trees.

There must have been fine navigation in that river. This work was for maintenance. It has to be continued, of course. Then at the end of this fiscal year the portion of the approved project accomplished is about 84 per cent. The available depth at low water is about 4 feet for the canal and 3 feet in the river. Formerly they had 3 feet at high water. Now they have got 4 feet at low water. That is a great improvement for the amount of money expended, which so far is \$276,729.23! That is the reference in the bill and a few of the items in the engineer's report. Now let us see about the Wateree River.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In this report that I have in my hand—the one furnished to Members—on page 131, I find that it says of the Santee River that the available depth at low water is about 4 feet in the canal and 3 feet in the river, and it says the tidal rise is 3½ feet.

Mr. TREADWAY. That would bring it a foot below the level; it would be half a foot less than when there was any water in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is important to get these facts before the House. I do not know anything about them, but I ask the questions to find out what the facts are. The gentleman from Massachusetts in his statement, reading from a report, said that at high water there was 3 feet of water in the river. This report says that at low water there is 3 feet, and 3½ feet tidal rise would make it at high water 6½ feet.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is reading from the report where it says that there is 4 feet in the canal and 3 feet in the river—that is low water. Now, I would like to pass on to the consideration of the Wateree River.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will wait a moment, let us see what the facts are. The gentleman said that at high water there was only 3 feet in the river.

Mr. TREADWAY. That was at the time that the project was begun, perhaps.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to know what it is now. It was begun in 1881—and naturally the tide has not changed any—and here is what the report says: "Available depth at low water, 4 feet in the canal and 3 feet in the river"; and at high water, with a tidal rise of 3½ feet, there would be 6½ feet.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I quoted from page 566 of the Engineer's report, which says that the lowest available depth is about 3 feet at low water.

Now, in reference to the Wateree River, we find that the work on the river has been snagging only. No dredging has been done. The expenditures have not resulted in a permanent increase in depth. We have spent on that project up to June 30, 1914, \$186,307, of which \$60,000 was for new works and \$126,000 for maintenance.

Now, as to conditions at the end of this year. The report says that it is not practicable to state the percentage of the completion of the project. The work is snagging, and will be continued indefinitely. No increased depths were obtained.



These remain about the same as before the improvement, namely, 3 to 4 feet at low water. The total expenditures under the existing project were \$195,000, of which \$60,000 was for new work and \$135,000 for maintenance. As to the effect of the improvement, they say that the project has had no effect on freight rates. There was practically no business on the river during the year. Some cordwood and staves were cut along the river and rafted out to market, but no records can be obtained as to amount or value.

It would be a great deal better for the Government to buy the staves and logs and let them stand as timber rather than to get the snags out so that they can be got down to market.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I can not yield; the gentleman can get his own time.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I only wanted to know what river the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. TREADWAY. To the Wateree River in South Carolina, and I am reading from the Engineer's report, on page 568.

Now, the third combined project is the Congaree River. Similar conditions exist on the Congaree River, as I find from this statement. The engineer says since continual work will be required to obtain the channel desired the approved project will never be completed. The expenditures have not resulted in a permanent increase in depth. The length of the improved section is from the mouth to Columbia, with the head of navigation at the foot of Senate Street, 51 miles from the mouth. The total expenditures on the existing project, which is also the original project, were \$599,029, of which \$363,674 was for new work and \$235,354 was for maintenance.

Now, as to the effect of the improvement, they say that no actual change in railroad freight rates has been made by the railroads themselves in order to meet competition. Complaints made by Columbia merchants of discrimination against Columbia in favor of Augusta have caused the Commerce Commission to order a reduction in certain rates, thus giving Columbia the same advantage because of water transportation that had been given to Augusta, Ga., for the same reason.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that I have a right to oppose such projects as this, even if I do not call attention to each one individually, as the chairman suggested that I ought to do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is water in the Wateree River, judging by its name. Here is a river where up to date we have expended \$195,000, of which \$135,000 was for maintenance, and it is contemplated to use \$15,000 the next year for maintenance. Nothing for the further improvement of the river, just to maintain the existing condition. It is not expected that commerce on the river will grow any because the situation is not to be changed. It is only for the protection of existing commerce.

I know nothing about the river except what is in the name and the report. In making these appropriations it is quite proper that we should examine the commercial statistics. Of course if you are improving a river commerce may increase after the improvement, but all this proposition does is to expend \$15,000 to maintain existing conditions, to take care of the existing commerce.

I read from the report of the committee:

Commercial statistics. None reported for the year. A few logs were floated and some shingles and staves were hauled by a gasoline boat.

That is the commerce of the river. A gasoline boat, and owing to the high price of gasoline I am confidentially informed that that boat has gone out of business. [Laughter.] But to maintain existing conditions, to take care of existing commerce, it is proposed to expend \$15,000 in order that these few logs may be floated down the river, and if there is any water in it they would float anyway, and to provide that a gasoline launch may take down a few more shingles and staves. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] said that the Government might easily buy these shingles and staves and let them stand as timber. Mr. Chairman, the Government could afford to buy the shingles and staves and put them into buildings and in barrels and save half the money. It is useless to send them down the river. We could build a house there, put the shingles on the house, make the staves into barrels and fill up the house and let them lie there and rot and be ahead \$7,500 on the appropriation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, there was one remark made by each gentleman that I could not help but agree with, and that is that they knew nothing about the project and nothing about the conditions surrounding it. This has been noticeable in other things that they have discussed, but certainly nothing to which it is more applicable than their remarks directed to this project. Fifty-five thousand dollars is

included for these three rivers, and these three rivers connect not only the capital of our State but other towns of considerable size with the coast. If they do not succeed in transporting a single thing on that river during the year, the money that is saved to the capital of the State alone by the difference in transportation rates would more than justify the appropriation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, I will yield, although the gentleman would not yield to me; because the rule on this side is always to be courteous.

Mr. TREADWAY. I might say to the gentleman that my reason for not yielding was that my time had already been extended, and the other day a gentleman on that side objected to my having a further extension—not the gentleman who now has the floor, however.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am sure that the gentleman's modesty would prevent his asking for additional time, but I will permit him to proceed out of my time.

Mr. TREADWAY. I only want to call attention to the question of the freight rates in connection with the Congaree River; that it was necessary to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission to have fair treatment for Columbia, and it had nothing to do with the question of navigation. The Interstate Commerce Commission provided the rates, as will be found on page 531.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Oh, I can not yield to all gentlemen. That would be three to attack one.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But this is not an attack. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Oh, I thank the gentleman. It is such a surprise to find that there is anything from my State that is not attacked on that side I was misled. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has twice referred to the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission reduced the rates, but the report goes on:

Thus giving Columbia the same advantage because of water transportation that had been given to Augusta, Ga., for the same reason.

That is something of a qualification to the gentleman's statement, and I want to know what the facts are.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, as stated by my colleague, the statement made is absolutely correct. The truth of the matter is that when the gentleman states we got relief from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the gentleman did not state that one of the reasons we were entitled to it was because of water transportation and competition. What he said was partly true, but not entirely true, and the gentleman might have said that but for water transportation to the capital of the State we would not have gotten the relief to which we are entitled, which this water competition gives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not want to cut off any reasonable debate—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I never ask for any unreasonable debate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MANN. All I want is a couple of minutes, maybe less. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] wants a couple of minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I object; I think we have had enough debate upon this.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words of the paragraph. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] talked about the Congaree River. He is right. I know nothing about the Congaree River. I was talking about the Wateree River, and the Wateree River is not the one that helps to reduce the freight rates to Columbia, S. C.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. But to Camden, S. C.

Mr. MANN. I read from the report of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors made to this House upon this bill concerning the Wateree River and its improvement and maintenance:

Effect of improvement: The project has had no effect on freight rates.

Now, if the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] has information that the project has had an effect upon freight rates he ought to have communicated that information to the gentleman from Florida or some other member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have usually trusted to the statement of facts made by the gentleman from Florida, and I do now. It has no effect on freight rates, and there is no commerce to be taken care of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Savannah, Ga.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$545,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 16, after the figures "\$545,000," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"Provided, That no part thereof shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the report shows that the Government has two seagoing dredges that cost \$135,000, or proposes to purchase two such dredges. There is left also an item of \$90,000 for dredging, which it is proposed to do by private contract, and in addition to that, either under contract or by Government plant, as may otherwise appear the most advantageous to the Government, \$150,000 additional. There will be \$240,000 worth of work on this project, which I think is a meritorious project from the statement made by the gentleman from Florida, that may be let by contract. The committee has already provided that in letting a contract by the Government the engineers will be limited in the price at which they are let, so that the contract price shall not equal more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of the work to the Government if done by a Government plant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Where is that to be found?

Mr. GOOD. We adopted an amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We adopted one amendment that applied to one project.

Mr. GOOD. I say the committee has already adopted an amendment to apply to inland waterways at Norfolk, and I was in hopes that the gentleman from Florida would accept this amendment. The committee has already adopted as a principle that 25 per cent in excess of the price it costs the Government to do the work is quite sufficient profit to the private contractor. Why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] almost smashed this mahogany desk with his fist in denouncing that as a principle, proclaiming that the adoption of that latter amendment was the end of all waterway improvement. If it means the end of waterway improvement for this House to say that in letting private contracts we shall not give the private contractor more than 25 per cent in excess of the cost to the Government to do the same work, then we might as well come to the end first as last. Why, think of it. You gentlemen who have investigated the cost to manufacture by the Government know that it always costs the Government more than it costs a private contractor or manufacturer.

This amendment, therefore, instead of limiting him to 25 per cent profit, does not limit him to below 35 per cent profit. If the work is being done cheaper by private contract than it could be done by the Government, the amendment does no harm, but if the work is being let at twice what it costs the Government to do the work it will save the Government many thousands of dollars, and we ought to save it. I contend that the committee should write into the law the principle that in letting the private contracts the engineers should not be permitted to go beyond 25 per cent in excess of the cost to do the work by Government plant. And that is all there is to my amendment. I was in hopes that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] would recognize the temper of this committee, where by a vote of more than 80 to 60 the committee determined to place that limitation on one appropriation, and there is as much reason for it here as there was in that case. It is true that the hearings do not disclose what it is costing the Government to do this work either by private contract or by Government plant. But if it costs no more to do the work by private contract than by Government plant, then this amendment does no harm. If it is costing it much more by private contract, it will save the Government a great many thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, not for the purpose of disputing with the gentleman from Iowa, although I did not support his amendment on the Norfolk to Beaufort—

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman did not oppose his amendment, but spoke after the amendment was adopted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I did not support the amendment, although I spoke after the amendment had been passed, and did it as effectively as I could to bring to the attention of the House this tendency toward Government ownership and control. I think it is highly probable, without knowing anything about the dredging business and not having any interest, of course, in the contracts of dredgers, that the amendment that was passed in respect to the inside waterway between Norfolk and Beaufort will lead to a great deal of trouble and confusion in the Engineer's Office. In the first place, as the gentleman from Iowa well knows, the law and the custom is to advertise for contracts for dredging or other work, and to award contracts to the lowest bidders. That is the rule of the Engineer's Office, and the work is supervised under the direction of the United States Army Engineers. The gentleman from Iowa has picked out two items in this bill of several hundred items, on which to attach his amendment. If he were dealing with the matter solely as to principle, he should bring this proposition before the House so that it might be general. There may be some reason for tacking this amendment onto the inland waterway between Norfolk and Beaufort; or there may be some reason for tacking it onto the Savannah Harbor proposition. I do not know, but I do not understand why, if the gentleman means to start on the road to Government control and ownership in matters of this kind and to put private operators out of business altogether, he picks out two items in the bill and leaves all the others to go scot free.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have indicated that this does tend to stop Government work. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. I offered practically the same amendment at the end of line 9 on page 1, and that applied to all the provisions of the bill, not tending toward Government ownership, but only tending toward a little economy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it was beaten in the committee, was it not?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. There were only about 60 Members of the committee present.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That refreshes the memory of all of us. When the committee was here attending to its business—

Mr. GOOD. Sixty Members out of a total of 435—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When the committee was here attending to its business the gentleman's amendment was defeated, but when the gentleman saw his opportunity to offer his amendment when few Members were present he managed to get it through.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will be fair.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope the committee will think this thing over before it votes for this amendment. There is no reason why this principle should be set up in respect to the item for the harbor of Savannah any more than with respect to any other item in this bill. I maintain that this tends to stop operations on these waterways.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman tell us whether 140 is more than 160, or less? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The House reversed itself, although it has done so before for reasons which I hesitate to mention here. The House is as capable of changing its view overnight or in an hour as some very distinguished individuals are who in control of the affairs of this Nation; but as there is no politics in this bill it is regrettable that the House does not know where it stands with regard to an important proposition like this. When the gentleman from Iowa offered his amendment, the House was awake and alive to its importance, and it rejected his amendment. But when the House was asleep, some eloquent gentleman talked about economy; and then the deed was done. The Chicago Tribune and other newspapers will doubtless have their scarce headlines, and the gentleman who saved the Government money will account for it to their constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman consent to have the same thing done under the Philadelphia item?



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If such an amendment goes in the bill it ought to be general, not pertaining to one item alone.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto end in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I object.

Mr. MADDEN. And I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I move, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is requested.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes, 25.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] said a moment ago that there was no politics in this bill, and there is not. But I want to say to the Democratic side of this aisle that if amendments of this character are going to be voted down, if the committee is going to continue to retain items in this bill such as the Wateree River, as you did a few moments ago, by the time this bill goes out of this House it will be as full of politics as any bill that was ever before this body.

I want to give you fair warning. A few days ago you voted to retain the tax on sugar. We upon this side voted for it at a protective proposition, and properly so. You upon that side voted upon it purely as an emergency, saying that you needed the revenue. If you are going to continue to keep indefensible items in this bill and say by voting down this amendment that you want the Dredging Trust to have a profit of more than 25 per cent, I say to you now we are going to meet you on the stump with reference to the items in this bill, and you will have some explaining to do, why you are voting and have voted to increase the cost of the workingman's breakfast table for the benefit of the Dredging Trust and authorizing the expenditure of money on rivers that have not a dollar's worth of commerce upon them, and never will have. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to say a word with reference to the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] that this amendment leads to Government ownership. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has declaimed many times upon this floor that Government ownership and Government operation is more expensive than private ownership and operation and has attempted to prove that assertion. Now, he says, or he implies, that Government ownership is less expensive and that a 25 per cent excess to private operators over Government cost is not a fair return to the dredging companies.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman misstates the situation, so far as some of my alleged speeches are concerned. I have contended that the Government manufacture of munitions in the Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia, which I have specified, has been cheaper than the manufacture of munitions in private plants. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate. I have confined my remarks to one institution.

Mr. LENROOT. I am not mistaken, for the gentleman, with reference to the building of battleships, has made that contention on this floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I may have so stated as to the building of certain ships, overhead considered. That is true.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, the gentleman says that 25 per cent profit to the Dredging Trust of the United States is not a sufficient incentive to keep them in business. I say that if that is true, the Government had better go into complete operation. This bill carries over \$40,000,000. If a 25 per cent saving could be made, \$10,000,000 could be saved in a single year, and it would take only three or four years for the Government to own all the dredges that are necessary and then save money by it.

Mr. Chairman, I very much regret if Members take the position that the Members of this House must follow the recommendations of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, irrespective of the merits of a proposition. It is no reflection upon that committee if we choose to vote down a proposition. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors is the only committee in this House where the members seem to take the position that the House must always and under all circumstances sustain it. We have no hesitation about disagreeing with the conclusions of other committees, and why should we as to the conclusions of this committee? I am sure the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] and other members of that committee desire that the Members of this House should deal with this question on its merits, and they will not punish anybody for disagreeing with them upon any proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], who offers this amendment, is of the opinion that it will effect economy, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] thinks it ought to be adopted for the same reason. Unquestionably they are perfectly sincere in their position, and if they were right the amendment ought to be adopted. Now, all this arose out of the fact that as to one project the engineers reported that the Government dredges had been able to do a certain piece of work more cheaply than similar work was done by contract. That was simply sporadic and exceptional. This amendment provides that where a bid is at a price exceeding by 25 per cent what the Government could do the work for, then the bid shall be rejected and the work shall not be done by private contractors.

Mr. Chairman, the difficulty with this amendment is its impracticability. While the Government owns a large number of dredges in the aggregate, yet in proportion to the total work the number is exceedingly small. This amendment seeks to set up a standard here which can not be complied with. In the first place, it has been said in this debate—and is a fact, as I understand it—that the engineers in reckoning the cost of Government dredging do not take into consideration the investment in the dredge or the overhead charges of supervision by the engineers, but substantially only the labor cost involved. That is a very large proportion, but it is not all.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Upon what authority does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. SMALL. I can not cite any authority; but unless I am greatly mistaken it has been so stated before our committee by some engineer. Does the gentleman know to the contrary?

Mr. MADDEN. All I know is that on various occasions in the House it has been stated, when provisions similar to this were under consideration, that the Government authorities took into account not only the investment but the overhead charges, the depreciation, and everything incidental to the work in which they were engaged.

Mr. SMALL. By to-morrow I will attempt to verify it. I can not give the authority now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, this is an impracticable standard to set up. But I want to say further, in conclusion, every safeguard is thrown around contracts made to-day for the improvement of rivers and harbors. There is an advertisement. There are open bids. The right is reserved to reject any and all bids if the amount is too high. The engineers, with all the information then at hand, endeavor to ascertain the reasonableness of the bid, and if it is unreasonable they reject it. So there is every precaution to obtain the lowest price at the present time, dependent upon the integrity, the skill, and the ability of the engineers who have the final word in the letting of the contracts. I do not think this amendment will tend in the slightest degree to effect any additional economy.

This is not the only public work done by the Government. There are public buildings, there is work for the Army and for the Navy and for the other departments of the Government, all regulated by a general law, and a very large proportion of the work is done by contract. There are no unusual complaints in

the other activities of the Government, and I take it there is no well-justified complaint here, and the amendment is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Goon) there were—ayes 41, noes 40.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 50, noes 41.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$53,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, lines 22 and 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out lines 22 and 23.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I made reference to some high-sounding names as being the principal part of the item covered. Here is a worse one as far as names are concerned: Alta-ma-ha, Oco-ne-e, and Oe-mul-ge-e Rivers. I am sorry for anyone who has to navigate vessels on those rivers. But I have made a mistake in speaking of vessels. There is no such thing there. I have in my hand a report of the hearing on these wonderful rivers, held on January 14, 1916.

Mr. HOWARD. Let me correct the gentleman on his pronunciation of those names. They are the Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee. I have fished in all of them, and know all about them.

Mr. TREADWAY. I congratulate the gentleman on his facility in pronouncing those names, which he has evidently acquired by long practice. I can not swing my tongue around them. But I want to refer to the report of the hearings before the committee. The chairman of the committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] the other day offered some criticisms or references to my speaking about shallow rivers. This is one of them. The witness appearing before the committee was Mr. Walter De Four. He stated:

The shallow water made it necessary for us to get together all the information that it was possible to get and then, in addition to all the information we could get from the outside, to apply a little ingenuity of our own and develop a boat about which Mr. Long will tell you later on—a boat with which we are able to navigate the river. We can now navigate this river, which is something we were never able to do before, notwithstanding the fact that the people of Macon had spent more than \$100,000 in the building of boats.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH], who sits by me, suggests that they could navigate the boat a great deal better if they put wheels under it, because then they would not need any water at all for the keel and the rudder.

Then Mr. De Four goes on to say:

That boat is now in actual operation.

Think of it, gentlemen, a wonderful advance. They are asking Congress to appropriate money for these high-sounding names, and there is actually a boat in operation on the river, by the testimony of a gentleman who appeared before the committee. Then he goes on to say:

When we appeared here in 1914 we promised to build a boat and put it in operation on the river if given the necessary appropriation. We did not give up, but we have built the boat.

[Applause.]

A wonderful event! Further description of the boat:

In building this boat and operating it since July 20 last, we have learned more about navigation than we knew when we undertook to build that boat.

[Laughter.]

They learned considerable about navigation.

As the result of that, we now have in process of construction a boat that is built on even higher scientific principles and more advanced theories than the former one. With the information about this boat which Mr. Long will be able to give you later on, you can go back home to your people and assist them greatly in the navigation of the waters throughout their territory. I would like to impress upon the members of the committee that what we have done is the best that we could do under the conditions. We were forced to do something, and usually a man can do something when he is forced to do it.

This is the kind of an item by which this bill secures the reputation of being "pork." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I really thought the gentleman who has just taken his seat, being a member of the River and

Harbor Committee, would at least have submitted this proposition fairly.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I will.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the Altamaha River was transferred to the State represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, how much of the State would be left uncovered by it? [Laughter.]

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in these few minutes is to state the facts. I have no desire to deal in personalities or make insinuations against anybody. The truth about the proposition is this: The boat that the gentleman from Massachusetts refers to applies solely to that part of the river from Macon, Ga., down to Hawkinsville, where for years and years we have been trying to navigate the river, but were prevented from doing so because the Government did not supply the little money to dredge the river. The Oconee River on the other branch is practically in the same condition. They have been unable to use it because the Government, through a parsimonious method of appropriating funds, applied just enough money to use a little on the various places where they run together and form the Ocmulgee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have an indistinct recollection that a company was formed to operate boats on the river.

Mr. WISE. That is correct; and they have built a boat and are carrying commerce all the year around except a month or two in the summer, when they can not do it because the Government has not cleaned the river. They not only have built one boat, but they have another under construction, and they propose to continue to build the boat and put them on the river from Macon to Brunswick, Ga., and to Savannah, Ga.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to know whether agriculture and commerce have been developed in consequence of putting the boat on.

Mr. WISE. Yes; the report shows that in 1913 there were 16,000 tons in this part of the river, and now there are 169,000 tons over this particular part of this system. We have built a boat and are still building them, and the commerce is growing, and all we need is a little money. Gen. Kingman recommended \$120,000 a year for five years to put the river system in a condition where it could be used. Not only that, but by virtue of the improvement freight rates have been reduced from 25 to 40 per cent up to Macon, Ga.

Now a few words about the whole situation. There are 494 miles of navigable river. You propose to spend only \$53,000 to maintain it and continue the improvements which have been recommended heretofore. Five hundred miles practically, and \$53,000 for all that system.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How deep and how wide is the river?

Mr. WISE. The channel at Macon, the head of navigation, has now 3 feet of water. We are insisting that it shall be increased to 4 feet in depth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

[By unanimous consent, the time of Mr. Wise was extended five minutes.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say there are 500 miles of this project running through 24 counties in the central part of the State of Georgia. Now, there are grown in those 24 counties, according to the last census, 500,000 bales of cotton and twice that weight in cotton seed, besides all the other products that will be affected by this improvement. There are at least a million people directly affected by the improvement on this system of rivers who will receive the benefit of any reduction in freight rates, which, as I say, has already been 25 to 40 per cent, as shown by the report of the engineers.

Not only that, but it is shown that this system will affect Macon, Ga., which has one to two millions of freight. We come here and ask for the paltry sum of \$130,000, what the engineer recommended; but the committee, in accordance with their policy of not increasing anything, but cutting down everything, recommended only \$53,000 for the entire system of 500 miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the State in any way contribute at all to the expense of keeping these channels clear?

Mr. WISE. It does not; because under our State law we can not do it. What right has the State to improve navigable rivers?

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the municipalities contribute anything?

Mr. WISE. Yes. Macon, Ga., went to the legislature and secured the passage of a special act to allow them to do that.



In the city of Macon they contributed \$5,000, and propose to spend the same every year on the terminal. If there ever was a meritorious project, a meritorious system, it is this system of rivers. They would be justified in spending what the engineers said we ought to have—\$125,000 a year for five years—and finish it. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in the discussion of this particular item but inasmuch as the gentleman from South Carolina objected to the continuation of the description of this boat by the gentleman from Massachusetts I think the committee ought to have the benefit of it. We are asked to appropriate \$53,000 a year to keep this boat running.

I want to read a little further description of this boat, given by one gentleman who appeared before the committee. He said:

There is not a piece of wood in this boat as big as your lead pencil except what went into the screens to keep the mosquitoes from biting the crew and what went into the construction of the ice box.

[Laughter.]

Here is another thing about this wonderful boat for which they want \$53,000 a year to run:

We were just as careful about the installation of the power in this boat as we were about the boat itself, because we realized that that is the heart of the boat. If we made a mistake in the installation of the parts the whole structure would be a failure. We investigated every engine made in this country, and I regret to say that we had to select a European article to put in that boat because of its superiority. We selected a Boiling engine, manufactured at Stockholm, which requires 28 cents an hour to run.

We put an electric plant on this boat. We can blow a horn or, rather, a whistle by electricity and do various other things.

[Laughter.]

We have a number of conveniences and so on. Our boat carries 83 tons on a 30-inch draft; 160 tons on 48 inches. We can load that boat down as low as 54 inches. When those photographs get back to me I will go into detail, because there are some points that are very important. It requires a crew of 10 men on this boat to run it night and day. We do run it night and day. By the way, it is the first boat that was ever installed on that system of rivers that runs night and day. It is the first boat that ever made the trip between Hawkinsville and Macon in less than 40 hours' running time.

We have solved the problem of navigating water less than 4 feet in depth, without a shadow of doubt.

[Applause and laughter.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] reading this report. It is quite a relief to hear anything by way of pleasantries from him, instead of his whining about hard times. Usually we hear him talking about hard times and the calamities of the country, and we have grown so accustomed to hear his mournful voice, like that of a dog who has lost its owner, that this bit of pleasantries upon his part, I am sure, is highly appreciated by more than one gentleman here. As to the gentleman from Wisconsin who spoke just now, again reverting to the Wateree River, I do not know whether it was the thought of the workman's breakfast or the sight of water that caused this rabid frothing of the "watchdog of the Treasury," but certainly the gentleman is too late in getting into action, because if he wanted to say anything about the Wateree and wanted to test the strength of the House on that proposition, he ought not to have sat supinely in his seat, but should have demanded a vote by tellers. The truth of the matter is that he has been so engaged in filibustering that he has lost sight of everything else.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. About five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore taken but little time of this House, but to my mind a very peculiar spectacle has been presented in relation to this amendment. Here we have the information before this House that a million people are interested in a stretch of river from four to five hundred miles long, and have secured in this appropriation bill the pitiful sum of \$53,000, in the section of the country where because of previous condition the people are poor, a few on the minority side have slipped into the Democratic side of the House and have gotten the leaders of the Democratic Party to desert, as it were, this committee, and after having done that gentlemen on the other side of the House have seen cause to criticize and make fun of as good a people as God Almighty ever permitted to live, because they have not the grandeur of a steamboat that costs \$1,000,000. They make fun of the best those people have. That criticism is unjust, unkind, and unfair to that

southern country and its great people struggling, as it has been, during all these years. This is a mere pittance to hand out to a great people, and I am astounded that men of caliber, men in high position, should criticize and move to strike out this item which is recommended and reported by the committee. Every man is the architect of his own fortune in this House; every man has his own destiny to look after. I do not get one dollar for my district in this appropriation bill. We will get it later, if entitled to it. But when Members accuse others, either inferentially or directly, of being interested in a pork barrel, I feel like rising and resenting it on behalf of the entire membership of the House, because I do not believe there is a Member in the House on either side who cherishes such dishonorable sentiment. They say they serve notice that they are going to work politics. When has the time ever been when they did not work politics? Work it? Of course, they will. The majority—this side of the House—is responsible for the legislation that occurs here, and I, for one, even though I am not interested as much as some others, am willing to stand up and take my part of the responsibility. What has grieved my heart is to see my own people suffer themselves to be deceived on this side of the House. I came here to stand hitched. [Applause.] I came here to stand by the committees of this House. [Applause.] I came here believing that the great leaders of this House would not appoint upon the committees any but the best men, and it seems to me that the report of this committee should be sustained. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flint River, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$60,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 11, by striking out lines 24 and 25.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] may have been intended for me—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. FREAR. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As much as five minutes?

Mr. FREAR. Yes, I should like as much as five minutes on this matter that involves an expenditure of \$60,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto end in seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state, if the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] were directed at me, as suggested a while ago, that I have not spoken on any proposition for over an hour. There has been no attempt, I am sure, at filibustering.

I desire to say that if I consulted by own choice I would not oppose this proposition. I believe the gentleman who appeared before this committee and who is an estimable Member of this House has quite an interest in it, but the facts should be known to the committee. I can not understand why it should be in the bill in its present form. We spent \$421,000 on this river, which I believe is a large river. Last year \$40,000 was transferred from the allotment to this river and this year \$60,000. That makes \$100,000 in two years. The total traffic during last year was 37,000 tons. That traffic occurred close to the mouth of the river. The average haul is about 40 miles, which is near the mouth of the river.

According to the engineer's report only one boat makes an occasional trip above. I believe it is above Bainbridge, or some other town near there. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there ought to be some reasonable appropriation made for these rivers, but when a project has been under improvement since 1880, 35 years, and we have only 37,000 tons developed with a haul of 40 miles, and \$40,000 appropriated last year and \$60,000 this year, we certainly are not getting a proper return from the money that is being spent.

The suggestion has been made in regard to other rivers, by different speakers, as to waterways up in my own country. We have a river where I live that formerly carried a great commerce, larger than the Mississippi at that time or the Mississippi commerce now. It will carry large boats to-day, the largest on the Mississippi, and yet very little freight has gone

there in the last few years. Only a few hundred tons goes down the river annually. It seeks the railroads, as it seeks the railroads everywhere else when they are within reach.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman indicate what that stream is?

Mr. FREAR. That is the St. Croix River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much money has been spent on it?

Mr. FREAR. A little over \$100,000 some years ago. It will carry the largest boat that is on the Mississippi River to-day. I was going to speak about the appropriations made for the gentleman's river, which are very large indeed, and I wish to say there was as much traffic on the St. Croix, and far more at that time, than there was at the same time at Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask if an appropriation is made for it in this bill?

Mr. FREAR. No; nor for many years past, because there is no commerce. The river is large, just like the Flint River that is mentioned here, but it is commerce that should determine the question of appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman say that commerce ought always to go to the railroads?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has suggested that several times, and he has intimated that the railroads are interested in this bill; but they are no more interested than the dredgers, as the gentleman knows they are not, and he would not charge that personally.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course I would not.

Mr. FREAR. But his publication charges it by implication.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was trying to learn whether the gentleman prefers, in the case he cites, to have the commerce go on the railroad or on the river?

Mr. FREAR. We can not determine that question. It is according to what the needs of commerce are. It is not governed by preference, but by convenience and comparative expense.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the meager appropriations that have been given to this river through a long series of years that have amounted to the sums that the gentleman from Wisconsin refers to.

There was expended on that river in—

1892	\$12,080.74
1893	10,121.00
1894	7,560.76
1895	4,232.97
1896	4,874.75
1897	5,019.45
1898	1,346.10
1899	1,328.68
1900	5,373.88
1901	299.58
1902	430.15
1903	4,111.89
1904	14,469.96
1905	5,269.65
1906	6,662.03
1907	10,207.40
1908	19,781.40
1909	10,349.59
1910	17,402.19
1911	20,075.51
Total	160,998.28

Appropriations of that character, Mr. Chairman, can not mean any more work than the removal of snags and driftwood, the removing overhanging trees, and the raising of bowlders that fall into the river, and that should not be taken into consideration when you speak of permanent improvement. This river carries now some 37,000 tons of freight. From 1912 to 1914 it has increased over 11,000 tons, and the commerce is over \$2,300,000 on the river at present. There are five boats running on the river now regularly. And it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when we ask for these little appropriations it is considered wrong and called pork-barrel statesmanship, but when a four or five million dollar appropriation is asked for it is called broad, patriotic statesmanship; and I am against that kind of unfair discrimination. [Applause.] There has been more permanent improvement on the river during the past two years, in real aid of navigation, than has been accomplished in the previous 10 years.

This is a very meritorious project and should be carried through. The people are cooperating, and it will not be 10 years before we should have a commerce of not less than \$10,000,000 on this magnificent river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Coosa River, Ga. and Ala.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance between Rome, Ga., and Dam No. 4, Ala., \$68,000; completing

construction of the lock in Dam No. 4 and completing construction of Dam No. 5, in the State of Alabama, \$30,000; in all, \$98,000.

Mr. FREAR. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 12, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 7 and ending with line 12.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman how much time he wants.

Mr. FREAR. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in 10 minutes, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, and that 5 minutes of the time be granted to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the last river and harbor bill carried 10 different projects on which the engineers were directed to make a reexamination. The Coosa River was one of these projects, and no report, to my knowledge, has come before the River and Harbor Committee to determine the merit of this particular river. The mouth of the river is three hundred and some odd miles from tide water, where it opens into the Alabama, I believe, and it is over 280 miles farther up the river to where this project is being carried on. In other words, the river as a whole is not navigable. It is much like a bottle in the fact that at the upper headwaters they have made some improvement for navigation, and down at the lower end of the river there are some improvements, but nothing has been done between the head and lower river. The Army engineers have urged that in a case of this kind the whole river be improved instead of building these locks and dams at different points. And on page 9 of the Coosa River report Maj. Brown says:

I consider the improvement of the entire river as more important than that of that between Rome and Gadsden.

This improvement is going on with the understanding that until we have spent all the money, reaching many millions and now reaching over a million dollars, the river will not be in navigable shape.

Now, the Alabama Power Co. has a number of power plants upon this river. They so advertise in their literature. There are some dams being built—I have forgotten just how many—on this river, and have been for a number of years. The open-channel work is 30 per cent completed after all these years. Navigation is now practicable between Rome, Ga., and Dam No. 4 for the entire year, with 3½ feet, but down below that there is an obstruction again and no chance for any navigation.

The commerce last year, after deducting wood and timber from the 28,000 tons, amounts to 17,427 tons, the result of an expenditure of \$1,384,000. On page 349 of the engineers' report it says that the decrease over last year is probably permanent. Only one boat is operating on this improvement, and that is not a paying investment. The cost of maintaining the locks last year was \$15,000, interest at 4 per cent upon money invested so far means \$69,000 additional every year, and we are now proposing to put in \$98,000 more.

And I wish to suggest this in passing, Mr. Chairman, that this river is no different in character than many other rivers now being canalized in this country. We have canalized and spent \$12,000,000 on the Warrior, for instance, and only nominal returns have come from that large investment.

There is not a single river in this country that has been canalized where any reasonable showing can be made in proportion to expenditures that the Government has made on it. The highest type of men among economists, who are considered authorities in this country, have shown that it is impossible in this country to drive the traffic to the rivers. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to insert a brief statement from a gentleman who is one of the best authorities in the country, Prof. Moulton. I ask for that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

River transportation is usually analogous to that by canal, for comparatively few of our streams are really natural highways of commerce. As a rule, they are navigable for the purposes of modern transportation, in name only, rather than in fact. So long as the cost of canalization of a river amounts to forty, sixty, or a hundred thousand dollars a mile, it belongs in the same category as a canal. A river like the Rhine,



whose banks are firm, whose gradient is gentle, whose water supply is constant, and the cost of regulation of which is almost negligible, may indeed be regarded as a natural avenue of commerce, but a river such as the Mississippi, with ever-changing sides and shifting bottoms, with periods of alternating floods and droughts, and the control of which is, in the opinion of engineers, a greater task than the building of the Panama Canal, is no more to be regarded as a natural highway of commerce than any artificial channel whatsoever. The test of the commercial success of such a river must lie in the cost of rendering it navigable for the purpose of modern transportation. Our investigations have indicated that it is only in rare instances that river transportation can be made as economical as transportation by rail.

Mr. FREAR. Let me explain Prof. Moulton's standing as an expert.

In June, 1911, there was offered a prize of \$1,000, open to all the writers of the country, for the best work on economic and commercial subjects. The committee was appointed to pass upon the most meritorious of all contributions and included among its members leading authorities on economics, comprising J. Laurence Laughlin, of the University of Chicago; J. B. Clark, of Columbia University; Henry C. Adams, of the University of Michigan; Edwin F. Gay, of Harvard University; and Horace White, New York City.

Many contributions were offered by eminent men. The one receiving first prize of \$1,000 was unanimously given to Harold G. Moulton, a political economist, whose subject is "Waterways versus Railways."

Mr. Moulton traveled extensively throughout Europe and this country, making a careful study of the waterway question. Briefly speaking, he reached the conclusion that inland rivers and canals in this country can never compete with railways, and that in Europe, with a few exceptions, the same rule applies.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken in the statement that the Alabama Power Co. is developing several powers on this river.

Mr. FREAR. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not say "developing"; just opening.

Mr. BURNETT. I understood the gentleman to say "developing."

Mr. Chairman, every dollar of this appropriation is recommended by the engineers. The Coosa River is formed by the junction of the Etowah with the Oostanaula. From Mobile to Rome, Ga., is 825 miles that may be made navigable by opening up obstructions in the center of the stream. The upper stretch of the river is navigable from Rome, Ga., by the city of Gadsden, where I live, and there is navigation for about 200 miles down to Dam No. 4.

Thirty thousand dollars of this appropriation is recommended for the completion of Dam No. 5. If that is not done, if these improvements are not made, the engineer says in his statement before the committee that it will cost \$10,000 a year for the upkeep of the boats and machinery that the Government has in there and has kept in there for years.

Mr. Chairman, the engineer says another thing: The fact that the river is navigable and the fact that boats are running there has decreased freight rates 50 per cent on the railroads that run from Rome, Ga., to Gadsden, Ala.

This work has been going on for years. Sixty-eight thousand dollars of this appropriation is for dredging and for channel work and improvements on the upper stretch of the river. If these obstructions are removed, it will be the longest navigable stream in the South flowing into deep water except the Mississippi, and it is perennial navigation. It is not a stream that goes dry in the summer. The rainfall on the upper section of that river is greater than that on any other river in the United States except that on the Columbia River, in the country represented by my friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The Government has been dilatory, it seems to me, in not opening up all these streams, because it is a river that can be navigated all the year around. The engineer acknowledged that he was mistaken in stating before the committee that there is only one boat running on the river. There has been one boat running all the time, and in a letter that I filed with the committee it is shown that another boat has been completed, and it is carrying 16,000 tons of freight a year, and near where Dam No. 5 is being completed a company has been formed for the purpose of operating a third boat. Mr. Chairman, it is not simply small commerce, but the people all along this line get the benefit of the competitive rates. It holds down the freight rates on the railroads, and, as the engineer says, it gives them a 50 per cent reduction by reason of having the river there.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to strike out the paragraph will not prevail.

I have here a letter from a gentleman of Rome, Ga., addressed to Mr. LEE, of Georgia, in which it is stated that the railroad carries 400,000 tons a year, and the people get a 50 per cent reduction by reason of the improvements on the river. It is a 10-cent flat rate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired on this paragraph. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Miami (Biscayne Bay), Fla.: Continuing improvement, \$140,000: *Provided*, That the work proposed under the project adopted by the river and harbor act of July 25, 1912, may be done by contract if reasonable prices can be obtained.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that, so far as my examination goes this is the only project in which that condition is attached. I ask the chairman of the committee what was the purpose of attaching that provision requiring a "reasonable price" on contracts entered with private parties in this case? I ask the chairman of the committee what was the purpose of attaching that provision to this particular project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think I can make it any plainer than the language itself is. It is for the purpose of having a reasonable contract.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the gentleman for that information. In view of that fact, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side, who have voted against the proposition offered by my friend from Iowa [Mr. GOON], to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have placed in this item that very proposition he urges, though without limitation as to the 25 per cent profit. They have placed that very proposition in the bill. Why place a limitation in this one case at Miami? Why not also at Philadelphia and in connection with every other project that we have? Here is a requirement that we must in this case have a reasonable contract performed. But who is to determine the reasonableness of it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. One reason for placing that in there is that the Government has no suitable dredges down there, and it was feared that if it were left to the bidders to bid freely and untrammelled—as, of course, they would—the Government having no dredges down there to hold them down, the bids would be too high.

Mr. FREAR. I fear the gentleman is entirely mistaken there, although the reason given is right; but I fear the result.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think it amounts to much, because the engineers are not going to make an unreasonable contract, anyway.

Mr. FREAR. It puts it up to the Army engineers, and we have had eulogies upon their judgment. Yet the engineers have made contracts reaching \$800,000 for the waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort at double the Government's price, or at least they did last year; and they would this year were it not for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON].

Col. Taylor stated before our committee—I believe I quote him correctly—that the very fact that the Government was engaged in dredging on any particular project had the effect of holding down private contractors to lower contract rates, and that their bids were lower by reason of the fact that a Government dredge was established there. I think that is substantially true. Yet the private contractors upon that waterway upon which we expended \$400,000 last year, named a price 80 per cent greater than the cost to the Government for doing the work with its own dredges. I do not know that I care to offer anything further, except that suggestion. It is well to place some legal restriction on contracts with dredgers, according to the facts developed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what was the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. A pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. I am opposed to striking out the last word. If that goes out, it all ought to go out. I would like to inquire what is the necessity of the appropriation at all at Miami? My recollection is that we imposed conditions of some sort down there. Is not this where the Flagler road runs?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it runs right through Miami.

Mr. MANN. Have those conditions been complied with?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; those conditions have been complied with.

Mr. FREAR. By the city.

Mr. MANN. Have they been complied with by the railroad?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The conditions imposed upon the railroad were transferred to the city. The city has assumed the obligation, and complied with the requirements of the act.

Mr. MANN. What were those conditions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can not repeat them all, but if I had time to refer back I could do so. There was a lot of work to be done in the harbor and a lot of work to be done in the way of furnishing terminals, and so on.

Mr. MANN. I have not refreshed my recollection, as possibly I ought to have done. My recollection is that the Florida East Coast Railroad was to do some dredging down there, and the city was to furnish some docks. Has either one really been done?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I said a minute ago, all requirements have been met.

Mr. MANN. The requirements of the committee may have been complied with, but have the requirements of the law been complied with?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The requirements of the law have been complied with. As I said, the conditions were finally assumed by the city. The railroad refused to carry out the conditions imposed by the original act. I think they carried out a part of those conditions, but finally failed to carry out the remainder. There was later some modification of those conditions by Congress. Subsequently the city assumed the obligations as modified, and has carried them out in good faith.

Mr. MANN. I read from the report, to which my attention has been called. I see it is stated—

It is anticipated that the city will be able to give the required assurance to the Secretary of War within a short time.

Whether that is a compliance—

Mr. SPARKMAN. That report was made last June.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; this is the report of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to my friend that that was taken from the report submitted by the Chief of Engineers last June.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand from the gentleman that we can not place any reliance upon the report submitted by the gentleman from Florida upon this bill? This report was submitted on February 24, 1916.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will try to make myself clear. What the gentleman is reading from now is, I fancy, an excerpt from the report of the Chief of Engineers submitted last June. Now, that was only published for the convenience of the House or anyone else who might want to investigate those projects. But I want to say that since that time the people there have complied with the conditions, have satisfied the Secretary of War that the conditions were complied with. Here is a statement that we have from Col. Taylor, January 24 last:

The city officials have entered into a contract for the completion of their work, and it is understood that the contract calls for its completion in the latter part of 1916. In order that the United States' work may progress at such a rate as to be completed at approximately the same time that the city's work is completed an additional appropriation of \$140,000 should now be made.

Mr. MANN. I see the gentleman who represents the Miami district [Mr. SEARS] is on the floor. While I have great deference for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], I have no doubt the gentleman from the district [Mr. SEARS] may have the information up to date, and I would like to ask him whether, in his opinion, these conditions have all been complied with?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that his time may be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied I can convince my colleague, the able minority leader [Mr. MANN] that this is a worthy project. Ever since 1902 the good people of Miami have been working to get access to deep water. The Florida East Coast Railroad Co. first entered into a contract to get this deep water and were to receive assistance from the Government. There was a suit against this company by the Government, which, as I understand, was won in the lower court by the Government. An appeal was taken, and this time the decision was adverse to the Government. This left the matter practically where it was. In 1912 there was an appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of deepening the harbor at Miami—that is, for the beginning of the work. It was estimated that \$300,000 would be required to complete the work. The engineering department reported that only \$140,000, instead of \$300,000, would

be necessary to complete the work; and on that report, not desiring to go beyond it, I only asked for \$140,000.

It has been said repeatedly in this House that the cities should render some assistance. I am truly glad that for the first project in the bill for my district I can state the people of Miami have shown their interest and desire to get deeper water and have bonded themselves in the sum of \$585,000 with this end in view—\$185,000 for the purpose of securing terminals and building the municipal dock; \$360,000 for the purpose of digging a channel across the bay to where the Government takes up the work. This distance is approximately 3 miles. Forty thousand dollars for constructing a municipal railroad on said dock. This shows the people of Miami are interested in the work, and it certainly shows their good faith when they are willing to spend \$585,000 of their money—and it is actually being spent, for the work is now under construction. Dredges are at work digging out the basin and the channel across the bay, and by the first of next year they trust the work will be completed. There are, I understand, 32 boats that now pass Miami because they can not go in there.

My district is 535 miles long, from Jacksonville to Key West, and there is no place between Jacksonville and Key West at the present time that boats with a draft of more than 10 feet can get in. Miami is approximately 360 miles from Jacksonville and 165 miles from Key West. If Members could only realize this, they would see how important it is to have this appropriation.

Now, I called up the Census Bureau the other day and asked them to give me the census of Miami. In 1890 they reported there was no record, but in 1900 Miami had 1,681 inhabitants. In 1910 it had 5,471, and I state to my colleagues on the floor of the House that to-day, less than six years from the census of 1910, the population of Miami is approximately 20,000. The city is growing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. MANN. Is that 20,000 population in winter or summer? Mr. SEARS. All the year round. During the winter we have a great many tourists, but they are not included in the 20,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this project means a great deal to the people of Miami. I would like to have the proviso so worded the Government would have to do the additional work of \$100,000 by contract. But I am satisfied the War Department so thoroughly appreciates and recognizes the importance of the proposition to this beautiful growing city that everything possible will be done to complete the Government's part of the project by the time the city completes her part.

If this appropriation is made, Miami will have a channel 18 to 20 feet in depth and of sufficient width to take care of her, rapidly increasing commerce, and I therefore sincerely trust all opposition will be withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's statement is so lucid and convincing that I have nothing further to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 17, after the word "obtained," strike out the period and insert a colon, and insert:

"Provided, That no part thereof shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Florida will accept the amendment. It is just like those that have been adopted, and I would like to have an agreement with the gentleman from Florida that it should apply to all the items in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it would be a good idea, in view of the action of the House to-day on two or three amendments, if we had one amendment before us, and that we let it go over until we have completed the bill and then take it up, discuss, and dispose of it.

Mr. GOOD. There are some items here to which it should apply, but I thought I would offer the amendment to the larger items, and then I would prepare an amendment, making the provision apply to all the items in the bill. If that can be agreed to, I will not take up any time on this amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Suppose we let this amendment be pending until we have gone over the bill.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman will not insist on this amendment. They have cut the appropriation from \$300,000 to \$140,000, and it is shown by the report of the Government engineers that they have had some very reasonable bids, cheaper than the Government could construct it.

Mr. GOOD. Then it will do no harm. If the bids are not more than 25 per cent in excess of what it would cost the Government, it will have no effect at all.



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to say to the gentleman that I would like to have an opportunity to look into this question. It seems to me a very important one, and if we can have a little time we may get more information.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said a few days ago, and in part read what amounted to an ironclad agreement from the dredgers and dredging associations, to use a common expression, to "hold up" the Government on the bids they might make for Government work. If that is true, and I suppose it is, it would look no more than proper that the Government should take the precaution to defend itself against a possible holdup by enacting into law some such provision as is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa. It is largely a question of fact whether the agreement was made between the dredgers and the association. What the gentleman from Iowa read was what purported to be a printed report of a meeting of these men in which they exulted over the fact that they had entered into an agreement for the explicit and only purpose of holding up the United States Government in any contract they might be called upon to bid on.

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about that except what is contained in the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment go over and be considered as pending until we finish the reading of the bill, and then we can go back and dispose of it and any other similar amendments that the gentleman from Iowa may see proper to offer along the same line.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are a good many items in this bill to which such an amendment as the one presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] could not properly apply, and because of that fact it seems that it would be useless to make a single provision covering all the bill, because if such a provision is made in many cases, it might prevent the work for which this bill appropriates proceeding, but where on the face of the appropriation itself in any single item it appears to be advantageous to put such a provision as the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa into the bill, it seems to me that it ought to be put in where it is evident to the House it can be utilized to the advantage of the Government. If a general provision should be enacted, and that general provision might, and it undoubtedly would, embarrass many of these improvements—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is exactly what I called the attention of the House to more than once, and that is exactly what the gentleman, I think, voted to put in the bill. I agree with the gentleman fully that with the light now before us we can not tell whether a proposition like that should apply universally or not.

Mr. MADDEN. It can not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But that is the kind of proposition before us. What I want to do is to have it go over until the end of the bill is reached, so that we may have time to investigate the matter and find out what the engineers may say about it, and if it is practicable I certainly would have no objection to it. I do not want to see the Government held up any more than the gentleman does. I do not know whether there is a dredging trust or not. There may or may not be one; but whether there is or not, I do not want the Government to pay one cent more than a fair price for the work.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say to the gentleman from Florida that I think it is not practicable to apply the amendment to such cases as the North Carolina case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let it be pending, then.

Mr. MADDEN. And to the Georgia case.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. And perhaps in this case—yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] if it was his intention to have this apply in any other case than dredging—that is, this general proposition?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does he want it to apply, for instance, to the building of dams, locks, and so forth, or is it to be confined to dredging?

Mr. GOOD. It is limited by its terms to those items where the Government has a plant to do its work, because the comparison is by Government plants, and therefore it might not apply to those items where the Government has no plant and

where it could not make an estimate. However, it should apply to all work provided for.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the gentleman generally has referred to the case of dredging, and to a possible combination among dredgers. I wanted to know whether he intended to cover anything except dredging where the Government had a plant?

Mr. GOOD. What I was going to ask the gentleman from Florida is whether or not he would object to my amendment being offered at this time as a new paragraph and modified so that it will read—

That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant.

It would then apply to the entire bill, and then we could let that amendment be pending until the completion of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman should have permission to offer his amendment—of course, he has that—but I think that all amendments like that should go over until we have finished reading the bill for amendment. I, for one, want to get some more information than I have at present before finally passing upon it.

Mr. GOOD. I do not care to take any unnecessary time. I only believe that the principle is right and should be written into the law. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment and offer it as a new paragraph, so that it will read:

That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let that be pending until we reach the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa will be permitted to modify his previous amendment, and will offer, in the nature of a new paragraph, the amendment which the Clerk will now report.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] pertains only to the amendment attaching to the present paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just directed the Clerk to report the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was asking as to the understanding between the gentlemen.

Mr. GOOD. It will apply to everything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 17 insert as a new paragraph the following:

"That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plants."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are we now to consider the request for unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it should be submitted to the House. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, which has just been reported, be considered as pending, and that no action be taken upon it until the conclusion of the reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object; this is a very serious matter, and the amendment is so general in its terms that I do not feel that we ought to be involved to the extent of passing it by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are not passing it by unanimous consent. We are passing it over until the end of the bill, and then we will take it up and consider it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to know if the gentleman from Iowa intends to offer any more amendments following the action on this request for unanimous consent?

Mr. GOOD. No. The intention was to offer it as a new paragraph at this time. I understand that it will be likely transferred to some other place in the bill where it will be appropriate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My objection to this request is this, the gentleman from Iowa has offered two amendments, which have passed, one pertaining to one item in the bill and another pertaining to another item in the bill, whereas he has not offered an amendment with respect to hundreds of other items in the bill.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman I did not care to take the time of the House to offer an amendment to every

little item. I am satisfied that that would prejudice the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I object.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a disposition to rush this thing through, and the easiest way is to object.

Mr. SMALL. If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would suggest that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] wishes to revise his amendment so that it would be applicable to the whole bill.

Mr. GOOD. I have already been granted that permission.

Mr. SMALL. And then have that pending, to be considered at the end of the bill. Now, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] object to that, a revision of the amendment so that it will be applicable to every appropriation in the bill, and to be passed over and considered as pending and taken up at the end of the bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I should like to know when we come to consider this proposed general amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa at the conclusion of the reading of the bill, in what position we will be with respect to two items in the bill to which this amendment has already been attached, irrespective of the fact that dozens of other items have already been passed to which it has not been attached?

Mr. SMALL. That will take care of itself at the time. All items have already been amended. That may be reconsidered or it may be put to the House when the committee reports to the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman recalls this fact: That the committee originally refused to consider this amendment and voted it down as a general proposition. Then the committee reversed itself and passed this amendment attached to the inland waterway item as between Norfolk and Beaufort, and then on a subsequent vote as to the Savannah Harbor it again attached this amendment. The gentleman from Iowa did not offer his amendment with respect to any other paragraph except these two.

Mr. GOOD. There were no large items intervening.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am asking if he is willing to have withdrawn by unanimous consent the two amendments that have already been passed with respect to the items separated from all others in the bill, that we may bring the whole matter up for discussion?

Mr. GOOD. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania willing that we should return and vote on the proposition on the Philadelphia item?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It ought to be general.

Mr. GOOD. Of course; and that is the reason I have offered this amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago objected to the unanimous consent to have this amendment pending. Did not that make disposition of it?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Iowa, at the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], renewed the suggestion. The Chair was simply endeavoring to give the committee an opportunity to come to an agreement, if possible, touching the matter. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MADDEN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] reserve his objection for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] for unanimous consent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on matters about which I spoke.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. The question now recurs on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. On the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as pending, to be returned to when we reach the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as pending, to be returned to when the end of the bill is reached. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the gentleman from Iowa is willing to have the general question submitted irrespective of the two amendments that have already been adopted to special paragraphs in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I think, especially as to one of the amendments, that it is very important. Personally, I would not consent, and I do not see how the committee could again take up that question anyway.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman proposes to make fish of two items in the bill and fowl of all the others?

Mr. GOOD. No; I intend to make fowl of all of them.

Mr. FOSTER. We are going to put them all on.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. MANN. Then I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the amendment now pending may be postponed until the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] can have an opportunity to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] may be temporarily postponed until he shall have opportunity to perfect it. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Or to offer a further amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move now an amendment as a new paragraph, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 17, insert as a new paragraph, the following:

"No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay for any work done by private contract if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as pending, to be recurred to at the end of the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does this bring the general question up at the close of the reading of the bill?

Mr. SMALL. It will.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is correct about that. We have already adopted two amendments covering this same proposition, and I do not understand that they are to be set aside by the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SMALL. I am willing to take chances on that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is that the attitude of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, so far as the gentleman can speak for it?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; that means with the approval of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], if the amendment just offered passes, is it the gentleman's intention to offer the two amendments he has prepared?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that if this amendment I have offered is adopted, of course I would have no objection then to those amendments going out.

Mr. SMALL. And we will ask unanimous consent to take them out.

Mr. GOOD. The general proposition applies to them, and there would be no use in putting them in the bill twice.

Mr. CULLOP. We could take a separate vote on those amendments and strike them out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. That both amendments go over?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.



The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Pensacola, Fla.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing extracts from the report of the Board of Inspection for Shore Stations of the Navy Department on the Pensacola Navy Yard, dated August, 1913, in which they deal with the condition of Pensacola Harbor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the report referred to:

#### ADVANTAGES OF PENSACOLA AS A NAVY-YARD LOCATION.

Extracts from the report of the Board of Inspection for Shore Stations of the Navy Department on the Pensacola Navy Yard, dated August, 1913:

##### CLIMATIC AND SANITARY CONDITIONS.

"The climate of Pensacola and surrounding country is equable; extreme temperature of either heat or cold is infrequent. The land about Pensacola is of an undulating character, and is relatively high, rising in some places to about 100 feet above sea level.

"The sanitary condition of the naval station is excellent. The absorbent nature of the soil, a sandy loam, in this vicinity renders the sanitation more efficient than would obtain in other localities having a different formation, other conditions remaining the same.

"The absence of extensive areas of swamp lands so prevalent along the Gulf coast relieves this locality of the presence of infection-carrying mosquitoes. Malarial and kindred fevers are almost unknown in and about Pensacola.

"The water supply of Pensacola is taken from a gravel water-bearing strata 130 feet below the surface by means of 13 driven wells. This water is shown by chemical, microscopical, and bacteriological analyses to be of exceptional purity. The daily average pumpage for the year 1912 was 1,400,000 gallons. To increase this amount is only a question of more wells.

##### COAL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION.

"Under existing conditions, all the coal supplied to the port is brought over the tracks of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad.

"The project of building a canal from Pensacola to Mobile is said to be now under consideration by the district engineer of the Army Board for Rivers and Harbors, and, with the completion of such a canal, the coaling facilities of Pensacola would be greatly improved.

"In the course of a few years it can reasonably be expected that Pensacola will have such extended terminal and modern coaling facilities that the shipment of coal from this port will probably be one of its greatest exports. Further attention is called to the fact that the various railroads now in process of construction from Pensacola look to the coal trade as their principal source of income, and therefore contemplate extensive coal-pier facilities, with modern handling appliances. Before any dry dock could be completed, it is reasonably certain that the port is likely to possess such extensive transportation and coal-handling facilities as would make it a large coal supply and distributing center.

##### RAILROAD FACILITIES.

"The Louisville & Nashville Railroad makes New Orleans, Mobile, and Pensacola its three principal deep-water terminal shipping points.

"The Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway has in process of construction a road from Pensacola to Jasper, Ala.

"There is also in process of construction the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railroad, a line about 60 miles long, connecting Pensacola with Mobile.

##### BAY, ENTRANCE CHANNEL, AND ANCHORAGE CONDITIONS.

"Bay: Pensacola Bay is one of the most important harbors on the Gulf coast. The bay is about 19½ miles long in a general northeast by east and southwest by west direction, and has an average width of about 2½ miles. Its tributary bays considerably increase the area available for vessels of medium draft.

"Channel: From the entrance to anchorage off the city of Pensacola, a distance of nearly 7 miles, not less than 32 feet of water can be safely carried. The entrance channel is well marked by accurate ranges and buoys, void of embarrassing turns, and is easily navigable under almost any condition of weather.

"Anchorage facilities: There is a feasible anchorage for not less than 27 battleships in not less than 30 feet of water, in double column, interval and distance 500 yards, with excellent holding ground, and this without blocking the fairway leading to Pensacola. There is also available, without interference with shipping, a large area for the anchorage of torpedo-boat destroyers and the 'train' of a large fleet.

"In general: Pensacola Bay offers excellent and unusual advantages for a variety of drills. It is particularly adapted for boat drills, torpedo and submarine exercises.

##### POINT FOR EMBARKING TROOPS.

"The extent of harbor anchorage, depth of water at piers, salubrity of climate, extent of the water-front reserve possessed by the War and Navy Departments, accessibility of the port to the coal fields of Alabama, and the character of the pier facilities already in existence or under development, make Pensacola the most advantageous port in Florida as a point for embarking troops."

##### ADVANTAGES AS A NAVAL STATION.

(a) The great extent of the bay, its easy access from the Gulf, and the security afforded by the fortifications at the entrance.

(b) Its central position on the Gulf coast and location relative to interior portions of the country.

(c) The small rise and fall of tide and the stable condition of the ground, rendering dry-dock construction feasible.

(d) The general character and extent of its water front, rendering pier development a fairly simple and satisfactory matter.

(e) The location of the yard, 7 miles from the city of Pensacola, on a Government reservation, insuring freedom from objectionable dives and resorts such as are found frequently in proximity to other navy yards.

(f) Ample space in the towns of Warrington and Woolsey, as well as in Pensacola (with which there is efficient trolley communication), for the accommodation of workmen and their families.

(g) Equable climate, permitting out-door work all the year round. The board is unreservedly of the opinion that Pensacola is the best and only site practicable on the Gulf of Mexico for a navy yard of the first class.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may be accorded the same privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oklawaha River, Fla.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$10,000: *Provided*, That there shall be conveyed to the United States, free of cost, title to the land occupied by what is known as the "Kyle & Young Canal" and the "Morrison Landing extension" of the same, on the Oklawaha River, in the State of Florida, together with title to a strip of land on the east side of said canal of such width as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be required for the future widening of said canal and extension by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept said land and navigation improvements as the property of the United States upon the delivery to him by the owners of a clear and indefeasible title; and the said canal and extension shall thereupon become a free public waterway of the United States in place of the existing natural bed of the river: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit J. D. Young, or his assigns, to construct an extension of the foregoing improvements from Morrison Landing to Starks Ferry or Lake Griffin in accordance with plans recommended by the Chief of Engineers: *And provided further*, That said J. D. Young, or assigns, convey to the United States, free of cost, title to the land to be occupied by said proposed extension, together with any lands immediately adjoining the same on the west side, which may be needed for further improvement by the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman how much shorter will this make the transit by vacating part of the Oklawaha River and constructing a canal across part of the way?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman that I could not answer that offhand, but it will very materially shorten the distance to be traveled by the boats going up and down the canal, because the canal is practically straight and the Oklawaha River, as its Indian name implies, is a very crooked stream. I think the distance is about 3 to 1.

Mr. MANN. How long is the canal? I should think the gentleman would have some information concerning as curious an item as this one.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My recollection is—I can only state from memory—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will have to have something more than recollection if he does not want a point of order made on this item.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am doing the best I can.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has facilities for information right at his hand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am under the impression that the extension already constructed and the second extension will amount to about 2 miles in all.

Mr. MANN. How much?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it will figure up about 2 miles in all—that is, the two canals. One canal has been constructed by a private individual, who proposes to construct an extension.

Mr. MANN. I understand. About 2 miles in all?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it is about 2 miles. That is my recollection.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said he had no idea. I did not know but it was 50 miles.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is about 2 miles, as I recall.

Mr. MANN. How long is the river that we give up to these other people?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think it would be at least twice that distance, maybe more. One of the purposes that we have in view in doing this—

Mr. MANN. I supposed that the purpose was to shorten the distance, and possibly to make it less expensive, although I do not know about that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It will be much shorter, and, of course, less expensive to maintain. I will say further that this canal is a part of a land-reclamation plan inaugurated by J. D. Young, who has a large body of muck land which he is trying to reclaim, and in order to do this constructed this canal, and

as far as it is now built, whatever the length which he proposes to extend it. Now, of course, the Government does not want to stand in the way of the reclamation of this land. We want to help him if we can without injuring the Government, which it does not do; on the contrary, it benefits the Government very materially by shortening the stream which will have to be maintained hereafter.

Mr. MANN. How much work will have to be done on this canal by the Government after it takes it over?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nothing more than the present channel would require, in fact, not as much, except the annual maintenance, whatever it may be; and it is said that will be very small. It is not much there now, and it can not be any greater.

Mr. MANN. I suppose there is some business on the Oklawaha River now?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. When I was younger I can remember, I think, was considerable—was done by boats carrying passengers up and down the river, because it was said to be the most beautiful scenery in the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was correct in those days, and the scenery is equally beautiful now.

Mr. MANN. But now you are going to abandon part of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is only a part of it, and it is not the scenic part that is being abandoned.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Anclote River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$3,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We have passed a number of items in the bill, some of which are deserving of criticism, from my viewpoint; but I just wish to suggest about this item that, taking out the lumber, which, of course, will go with a very small channel, the improvement is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles long, and there is only a balance of 2,470 tons upon this project, and only one launch.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is this Anclote River?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and according to the engineer's report that the only real business on the Oklawaha River—and that there is only one launch running upon this project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have not had time to look up the matter, but I think there is more than one launch running in those waters. But that is of little consequence, as there is a great deal of other kinds of shipping. I venture the assertion that every week in the year there are as many as 100 vessels going through that channel. It is the great sponge center of that portion of Florida. At Tarpon Springs, located on that channel, are brought nearly all the sponges that are gathered in American waters. They are taken in there and distributed thence to other parts of the country. Not only that, but it is a great fishing center, and it is mainly for those purposes that this appropriation is made. I want to say further that there is hardly a small project in this bill that has more merit than this particular project, and I doubt if there are any with more merit.

Mr. FREAR. The tonnage of only 2,400 tons impressed me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Naturally so, but when you consider that it is made up largely of sponges, you will realize that while it is very valuable it is more bulky than weighty.

Mr. FREAR. I concluded it would keep one launch pretty busy. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Withlacoochee River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are three launches on this stream and 4 miles to the project. We have spent \$330,000 on it, and the commerce is largely for a phosphate establishment, as I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Outside of the phosphate there is practically nothing else.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very little.

Mr. FREAR. I want to ask the gentleman if the channel was built up for their factory or is there anything else up there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The channel was constructed at first by this phosphate company. The company, having in contemplation the improvement of the harbor down there, constructed a railroad, something like 20 miles in length, to the mouth of the river for the purpose of shipping their output of phosphate to that harbor there. Then the company went on to construct a channel to deep water in the Gulf at a very heavy cost to itself, I think more than \$100,000, perhaps as much as \$200,000. After that was done and while Senator Burton was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the Government

stepped in and took up the work and carried it on. It is a great phosphate shipping port. There is a great deal of foreign commerce that goes out there. A great deal of this phosphate is taken to foreign countries. If there is any falling off of the commerce it is due to the war, which has temporarily stopped those shipments.

Mr. FREAR. The commerce fell off 50 per cent last year, due to the war, they say.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is no question but that it was due to the war, for the phosphate goes mostly to foreign countries.

Mr. FREAR. Is that the only concern, the only one that is being served?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not entirely, but that one concern furnishes the bulk of the commerce there.

The Clerk read as follows:

Apalachicola River, Fla.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including the cut-off, Lee Slough, lower Chipola River, and upper Chipola River from Marianna to its mouth, \$6,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Clerk got by the item that I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida about. What success are they having in reference to water hyacinth, and what process do they use to overcome it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In most instances they use a mechanical contrivance. Often the method used is to concentrate the hyacinth in the center of the stream and let the current take them down to places where they can be disposed of, or still on down to brackish water, which kills them. They adopt almost any method to get rid of them, except spraying, which they did at first, but that method has been abandoned on account of its danger to live stock, which now they are not allowed to do.

Mr. MANN. They have not got far enough along to introduce hippopotami, with a view of clearing it out, have they?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. That, I believe, was suggested at one time.

Mr. MANN. I think I made the suggestion myself several years ago. I do not know but that it would be as effective as any process they have tried, and perhaps cheaper in the end.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alabama River, Ala.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including the Alabama and Coosa Rivers between Montgomery and Wetumpka, \$100,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item. I have passed over some questionable items without making the motion. I do so now in order to call attention to a condition which seems unusual for a large appropriation. In the past the appropriations for the Alabama have reached \$1,289,000. and this bill calls for \$100,000 more.

Excluding the logs and timber there are about 41,000 tons of commerce. On page 744 of the Engineer's Report, he says:

The effect of the river is to maintain effective water competition with the railways as far as Selma, and to some extent to Montgomery. The full effect of water transportation is not felt at Montgomery because of the failure of the boats to make good use of the means provided for navigation and of the merchants of Montgomery to patronize the boats. Water rates control most of the shipments to and from the country contiguous to the river below Montgomery. One steamer is above Selma.

It does not say how often the boat is run. From the showing made by the engineer's report that \$100,000 appropriated in this bill is a very large item, following as it does the large sum of money that has been appropriated heretofore. I believe we are making extravagant appropriations in view of the return we are getting on many of these streams. We passed one a moment ago, but I did not care to raise the point, where only one boat is on the stream, and that only running occasionally. I do not know of any other way of calling the attention of Congress to the condition of affairs we have on these rivers and creeks except by moving to strike out the appropriation, no matter what the action of the committee may be. As I said before, I can quote the best authorities on the subject, not only in this country, but those who have had experience in Europe, that the inland-waterway traffic there, with the exception of one or two streams and canals, is not a good investment compared with the small returns in commerce. Until we get some means here of controlling the railroad transportation so that we can withhold rates and prevent them from running the traffic off the rivers, as they do in so many cases, it is useless for the Government to keep throwing in large amounts of money as in this case, \$100,000, in addition to over a million dollars that has already gone into this river.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it the gentleman's theory that the Government ought to force the railroads to raise their rates in order to allow the boats to run upon the rivers?



Mr. FREAR. The theory of the European Governments by means of which they maintain waterway traffic is to have the railroad rate so large that it forces traffic onto the rivers. That is the policy pursued there.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that the policy that the gentleman advocates here?

Mr. FREAR. That is the policy that is pursued there. The policy that I would advocate here is not to make appropriations for streams unless they are carrying actual commerce, because you have your commissions, interstate and State, by means of which you can have the rates regulated. If at a river point, and you lower the rates below what they are 50 miles inland, some one inland has to make good the deficiency. With the State commissions and the Interstate Commerce Commission we do not need to make these large appropriations, because you have a forum to which you can go.

Mr. BARKLEY. How can it be correctly estimated how much commerce a great river might carry in an unimproved condition as compared with what it would carry if the river was improved from the mouth to the head?

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman's argument amounts to anything, it means simply this, that on all these rivers the traffic is steadily decreasing, from the Mississippi River down. I do not think there is a single exception that can be made. The traffic has decreased because of the railway competition throughout the country, and practically the same condition exists in Europe, except on the Rhine.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the traffic on a great many rivers has decreased because of the fact that they could not be navigated more than six months in a year, and that men refuse to put money into an enterprise that they can not work all of the year around?

Mr. FREAR. Then decrease the appropriations to a reasonable amount.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, does not experience show in these improvements that as the improvements have increased the commerce has decreased?

Mr. FREAR. That has been the experience in practically every case, probably not due to that cause, but simply because of the competition of the railroads or because it is found more expedient to use other means of transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SWITZER rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in one place in his lengthy minority report advocates regulating monopoly and in another place advocates the old competitive theory. I suppose he will do the same thing on the floor of the House. In other words, he wants the committee to understand that every ton of traffic that the river takes from the rail will in proportion to the traffic increase the rates to be paid by the patrons on some other part of the railway system because of the decreased traffic. He does not take into consideration that the opening up of some of these rivers and the developing of the river trade allows the manufacturer to concentrate in many places where he can get a cheap rate, sand, ore, coke and coal, lumber and timber, and thus enable him to manufacture articles at a price attractive to the general public, increasing the consumption of these articles and thereby increasing the general tonnage traffic of the railways and the rivers throughout the country.

But when the gentleman comes to that part of his report entitled "Where the money goes," and referring to the Mississippi River, he says that if we had taken the \$150,000,000 that has been expended on the Mississippi River and it had been invested in railways there would have been a decrease in railway rates in that section of the country. If it is right and proper to invest money in additional railways to decrease the railway rates, why not invest money in river development in order to decrease railway as well as water rates?

But if the gentleman will follow the expenditures upon the Mississippi River, he will not have to draw upon his imagination or indulge in the realm of speculation to find the development of the railways. In 1880 there were only about 500 miles of railway in the Delta of the Mississippi, and to-day there are 3,700 miles. Most of it is in the Delta of the Mississippi, because the levees along the river, protecting these lands, make the demand for these railways, and, in fact, the railways could not have been built in the Delta if the lands had not been protected

by the system of levees that is being now constructed by the Mississippi River Commission. Here you have, without drawing on your imagination, actual development of railways. But I protest against gentlemen, when it becomes convenient, in discussing one part of the bill advocating regulated monopoly and in another part advocating the competitive theory.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted on this paragraph. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tombigbee River, Ala. and Miss.: For maintenance of improvement from the mouth to Demopolis, \$25,000, and from Demopolis, Ala., to Walkers Bridge, Miss., \$10,000; in all, \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Just briefly, in reply to what has been said, it seems to me that it requires no answer for anyone who is familiar with the facts and who is acquainted with waterway-transportation questions. I have followed in my suggestions in regard to the building of railway lines the very propositions that leading waterway authorities and economists have made, men who have made a thorough study of the question. That same method of comparison is used with the European waterways as well as those in this country. The question occurs if the \$150,000,000 that has been put into the Mississippi River could not have been better invested by the Government. We could have built railroads with that money, many thousands of miles—built them and owned them—we would have had lower rates, whereas no material return comes from the waterways as they have been constructed.

Now, I say that that is the method of determination established by waterway writers so far as I have examined. If the Government has charge—and I am not advocating Government ownership—but if the Government had used that money for building railways we would profit from the investment. That is done in Germany and in other countries. If the money had been wisely invested we would have something to show for it.

That is the reason for the comparison; not because of any personal interest in the subject. I have given a rule of computation used by those who attempt to ascertain the result of such investments by this Government and by other Governments on waterways. And this perhaps has held true, according to the best waterway experts of waterways in Europe, outside of the Rhine River. The same rule can be applied, and they say probably it would be cheaper in Europe to use the money in reducing railway rates rather than to go on and make many of the expensive improvements which have been made on European waterways, canals, and rivers.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph beginning in line 24 on page 15 and ending in line 2, page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph beginning on line 24, page 15, and ending on line 2, page 16.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be an insignificant river, upon which there has been expended \$367,858.22 without any cooperation.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. That has been passed.

Mr. MADDEN. No. The gentleman moved to strike out the last word, and that left that thing open. Upon this river \$367,858.22 has been expended out of the Public Treasury, with no local cooperation, very little, if any, traffic on the stream, and then \$35,000, to be expended if this appropriation is to be adopted.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This river is a very beautiful river, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] frequently talk about its beauty, and how the birds sing in its trees along the shore, and how the sun shines, and how they can look through the darkness of the trees to the blue sky above, and can see the shimmering water below, and also tell about everything else that might be thought beautiful except the traffic upon the stream.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. This is not the river that was in doubt some years ago, and called for exploration by a noted explorer, is it?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. SLOAN. The doubt has been removed?

Mr. MADDEN. No; it will not be until we have heard from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. SLOAN. Is the doubt remover present?

Mr. MADDEN. He is.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. You do not want to strike the Tombigbee out of the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I thought perhaps it would be very beneficial to the bill if the Tombigbee were left out and this \$35,000 that is to be appropriated should be saved to the public.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I want to serve notice on the gentleman and on the House that if you strike out the Tombigbee you can not pass the bill, because you could not pass the bill without the Tombigbee being in it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Then, if the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi is a fact, I hope the item will go out of the bill, because it will be thirty-nine or forty million dollars to be saved to meet this great question of preparedness that we will have to meet in a short time, and it will be one burden taken off the shoulders of the Democratic leader of the House when he comes to prepare his revenue bill upon which we will all be called upon to vote. [Laughter.] I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that this item will be stricken from the bill and that this \$35,000 at least will be saved as the beginning of the end of a fund to be used later on for preparedness. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman desire to use?

Mr. MANN. Only a minute or two.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Mr. MADDEN, has moved to strike this item out of the bill, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] has stated that if the item relating to the Tombigbee went out of the bill, the bill could not pass, which seems to present a curious case of difference of opinion between the House and the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol known as the Senate.

Now, I have listened to the gentleman from Mississippi a number of times in the House while he talked very eloquently and convincingly about the Tombigbee River, but I hold in my hand a bill passed by the Senate the other day, where this river is slurringly referred to as the Tom Beckby River—the name of an individual, Tom Beckby. I want to know whether the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] calls this the "Tombigbee" River, one word, or the "Tom Beckby" River, two names?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A hyphenated name. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I would like to know whether the gentleman is going to permit the Senate to call this the "Tom Beckby" River? We know the gentleman from Mississippi by the name of "TOMBIGBEE CANDLER," and we know the name of the river by the name of "Candler Tombigbee." Is that all gone to the winds now? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Even the Senate of the United States would not undertake to change the name of the Tombigbee, because if they did that they would change the history of the United States of America [laughter], and it would be impossible to do anything of that kind, because the history made by the Tombigbee River is identical with the records made by this great Republic. It is the river that adds glory to this Republic. If you were to take it out, there would be no glory left. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says the Senate would not do such a thing. The fact is it has done such a thing. Here is a "bill for a bridge across the Tom Beckby, commonly called the Tombigbee."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The Senate of itself can not do anything, and I am glad it can not. It requires the concurrence of this House to do anything, and the change of the Tombigbee would be as impossible in this House as it would be to stop the sun as it shines in the firmament above. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANN. I will yield first to the gentleman from Nebraska, although I hope later to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. SLOAN. Why should we invest any money on this river? It is Mr. Beckby's river.

Mr. MANN. No; it is the Tombigbee.

Mr. SLOAN. What right have we to interfere with private waterways and interfere thereby with preparedness?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Nebraska is mistaken. While the name of this river is "Tombigbee," or "Tom Beckby,"

it does not belong to that gentleman at all. It belongs to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. CANDLER. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am very proud of my possession, because I consider it the greatest possession in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to inquire how much time the gentleman wants?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I merely want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will two minutes be sufficient?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. We ought to hear the annual speech on the Tombigbee River. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I may yield a portion of that time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]; but first I want to ask him this question: Whereas the question has been raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the two methods of spelling the name of this river, is it not a fact, highly creditable to the gentleman from Mississippi and also to the river of which he is the author, that where the name of a river is spelled in two separate and distinct ways it is entitled to two separate and distinct appropriations? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The Tombigbee River is entitled to a double appropriation regardless of its spelling. The spelling of the name has nothing to do with it. It has glory enough to entitle it to a double appropriation, whether spelled in one way or the other; but I resent any suggestion looking toward the changing of the name, because, as I have stated, I do not wish to change the history of the Republic. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has half a minute.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield that half minute to the gentleman from Mississippi to explain further about this glorious river of the South.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Everybody knows about it, and hence it is not necessary to explain it. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Pearl River, Miss.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance below Rockport, \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is the stream of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and I have here the statement that he made in regard to it. It is a very fair statement. I merely wish to suggest to the House a question of policy, which does not apply alone to this but to some of the other items that we have had before us. This statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is so clear-cut that it is a good example of the policy we pursue.

All of the traffic upon that stream is timber, logs, and lumber from one or two mills. There is no merchandise. The Government is engaged constantly in taking out the snags put there by the mills. The question is whether or not the Government wants to be engaged in that purpose. The question is one of policy, I admit; but it seems to me that it is a policy the Government ought not to pursue.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman is very fair in his statement. I am glad he has my remarks before him; but the gentleman is mistaken as to the lumber that comes down from the mills being the only commerce. The commerce is made up in part of logs coming from the lands of the settlers.

Mr. FREAR. I assume that; but the Government is engaged constantly in snagging the stream, and there is no merchandise upon it.

I have offered a pro forma amendment in order to call attention to it. The Government is engaged in taking out snags and the mills keep putting them in.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.



The Clerk read as follows:

Yazoo River and tributaries, Mississippi: For maintenance and improvement, including Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, and Big Sunflower Rivers, Tchula Lake, Steele and Washington Bayous, Lake Washington, and Bear Creek, \$45,000: *Provided*, That the sums herein and hereafter appropriated for maintenance of improvement of mouth of Yazoo River, together with any unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made therefor, shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word. What is the purpose of the proviso in this paragraph?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I can answer the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. All right.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Sixteen or eighteen years ago Congress adopted a project whereby the Yazoo River was turned through a canal into Lake Centennial in front of the city of Vicksburg. I will say that part of the project, the harbor at Vicksburg and the mouth of the Yazoo River, carried an appropriation of a certain sum. At the time that the original project for the diversion was adopted the harbor at Vicksburg was then under the Mississippi River Commission. That was transferred to the Chief of Engineers. A few years ago Congress undertook to transfer the harbor at Vicksburg back to the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, and in doing it—it was a Senate amendment and the House agreed to it—we transferred the entire item as it had appeared in the bill, the harbor at Vicksburg and the mouth of the Yazoo. The Mississippi River Commission is not at all equipped to get up through the lake to the mouth of the Yazoo Canal.

Mr. MANN. The purpose of it is to have it under the Chief of Engineers instead of under the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; this is to transfer it back to the Chief of Engineers, where it ought to be.

The Clerk read as follows:

Southwest Pass, Mississippi River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$600,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish some one who has the information would advise the committee as to the present depth of Southwest Pass.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My recollection is, about 32 feet; they are working to a depth of 35 feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there any appropriation here for the Southeast Pass?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not in this bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The South Pass? That is carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have had occasion to look up the Coast and Geodetic Survey records and have found, just to illustrate how rivers will silt up and how necessary it is to make appropriations for their maintenance, that the Southeast Pass, which originally had 12 fathoms of water, which would be 72 feet, has filled up to a very few feet.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do not know what the gentleman means by the Southeast Pass. There is no such condition in the South Pass, for that is the main channel for the entrance to the river.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What pass is used by vessels in the foreign trade?

Mr. DUPRÉ. The South Pass and the Southwest Pass have been used, and will be more largely used after the improvement is completed. They are the two passes used for vessels in the foreign trade.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One is closed up, is it not?

Mr. DUPRÉ. The South Pass is the one developed by the Eads jetties, and there is 32 feet of water there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not opposing this appropriation for the Southwest Pass. I think it ought to be made. I am referring to that region where there has been a considerable filling up of the channel.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In the Southwest Pass conditions have not been quite as favorable, and a board has gone down to investigate there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The present appropriation for the Southwest Pass is to continue the work for 35 feet, which has at present a depth of 28 feet?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Twenty-eight feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the channel used by ships in the foreign trade, entering New Orleans.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes; because conditions in the Southwest Pass have not been as good and satisfactory on account of the silting.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the channel being used to any great extent at present?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to bring out, if the gentleman please, that where there is a natural filling up of the channel appropriations for maintenance are in order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The silt at the mouth of the river is what closed the river before the Government took it up. The Mississippi River as it emptied into the Gulf originally filled up at the mouth, as all silt-bearing streams do when they empty into the ocean. So it was not possible for a ship drawing more than 12 or 14 feet of water to enter the river, although just above there the river is 100 or 150 feet deep. Along the city of New Orleans the river is 150 to 200 feet deep, but when it reached the Gulf the deposits took place and the river was closed. Many years ago, under what is known as the Eads jetty project, Congress appropriated money and undertook to build jetties and confine the water between the inner walls so that it would force it through and scour it out; and that took place and deepened the water considerably. That is true of the South Pass. There are three passes—the South Pass, the Southwest Pass, and Pass a Loutre.

Several years ago Congress adopted a project for a 35-foot channel and provided that it should be made through the Southwest Pass. That is the project that has been prosecuted for a number of years. As I understand, the depth of water is 28 feet, and there is no question, I assume, that when the project is completed it will develop a channel of 35 feet. So far no very great demand has developed for a 35-foot channel.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have brought this question up to try to show how interdependent we are in matters of this kind. We do business at the port of Philadelphia with the port of New Orleans, and if our vessels run on the shoals there or if yours run on the shoals up around Philadelphia, it is a serious matter. I happen to have before me now, borrowing it from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], a chart of the North Carolina coast. It is one of those coasts that by reason of its sandy formation is constantly filling up with shoals. That is so all along the Atlantic coast, and I wanted to have it understood that the same sort of conditions prevail down at the Passes of the Mississippi, where the business is not Mississippi's business alone, but Philadelphia's business, or New York's business, or Chicago's business. It is natural that those shoals should form, and it is necessary that Congress should make appropriations to keep them clear.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the Government, as on the Great Lakes, any dredges of its own for excavating the bars that form at the mouths of the rivers along the Gulf and in the delta of the Mississippi?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; all of those dredges are owned by the Government. There was a provision put in the law a few years ago, as I recall, that above a certain point here on the Atlantic coast north the Government should not construct any dredges, but that did not apply to the southern waters.

Mr. STAFFORD. All along the Gulf coast?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. And at the mouth of the rivers.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The report shows that there are two dredges owned by the Government that are constantly in operation at the mouth of the river.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I ought not to let this day close without expressing my very great pleasure at the return of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] once more to the Republican fold. Yesterday when he for the time being followed the President I was bowed with grief, and it disturbed me not a little, but since he has come back to-day I want to greet him. It is not very often that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is wrong. He is usually right, and as I have been reading these items of appropriations to-day I have thought of the fight that was made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself during the last Congress, and if the fight we

made had been won there would have been a different situation in this country to-day. I want to read a dispatch that I have received from Seattle that throws light upon what I have in mind. It is directed to the distinguished Secretary of Commerce. It is as follows:

SEATTLE, March 27, 1916.

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,  
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

Due entirely to section 13 of seamen's bill, 8 sailing vessels loaded with lumber for foreign trade have been delayed total of 53 days owing to inability to secure certified seamen. Some have been permitted to clear without full compliance with law. Two vessels are now waiting for crews not obtainable owing to seamen's bill. This is detrimental to our commerce and principal industry. There has been no delay clearing Japanese vessels or vessels from British Columbia, our competitors. We earnestly request suspension of the section until the Government can offer relief by better legislation.

MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE OF SEATTLE.

If we write a few more laws on the statute books like the seamen's law, it will not be necessary for us to improve our harbors, because no vessels will be able to sail out of them, anyway. I am proud to say that my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], joined me in fighting this law, the most vicious and destructive ever written on our statute books.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inland waterway on the coast of Louisiana: For maintenance from Franklin to Mermentau, \$10,000, and from Mermentau River to Sabine River, La. and Tex., \$10,000; in all, \$20,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read; and I desire to state that it meets the approval of the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 22, after the figures "\$13,000," insert:  
"Provided, That, of the amount herein appropriated, the sum of \$1,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended in removing the wrecked lock and dam near the mouth of the Mermentau River."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Removing the water hyacinth, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas: For the removal of the water hyacinth from the navigable waters in the States named, in so far as it is or may become an obstruction to navigation, \$20,000.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "hyacinth" in line 24. A few days ago I had the pleasure, and it was a real pleasure, of voting with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of retaining the duty on sugar so as to save \$41,000,000 to the Government. In a few weeks hence we will be called upon to vote for a bill to levy additional taxes to pay the expenses of the Government for the coming year, and we shall vote for that; we will have to; and here to-day, if the statements made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] are true, we are absolutely throwing away \$20,000,000 on improvement of rivers worthless to commerce, where there is no commerce, where there is not much water, and in this case where they have to take the weeds out in order that boats may navigate the streams.

We ought to remember, gentlemen on that side of the House, and there are not very many of them here, I think only about 25, and about an equal number of this side—50 gentlemen altogether, here to pass a bill appropriating \$39,000,000—we ought to remember that a good gentleman that used to be over in the Senate from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and who stopped the waste of public funds, is not there now. In the last Congress he saved this country \$42,000,000 by his opposition. There will be no person over in the Senate this year to do that, and when this bill goes from this House with its \$39,000,000 or \$40,000,000, it will come back with eight or ten million dollars more, and we will pass it, because there will be enough money going into the districts, not to benefit the rivers but benefit the people that want it, and a whole lot of other Members who want to favor them will vote for it also.

I think gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, in view of the fact that we need money to run this Government for the next year, in view of the fact that they put the duty on sugar for the express purpose of getting money, in view of the fact that we will be voting in a little while for more taxes on the people, would be wise if they would think the matter over and reduce the appropriation carried by this bill to what it ought to be, at least to \$20,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman propose by his amendment to strike out the word "hyacinth"?

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Yes,

Mr. HARRISON. If it should be stricken out, we would appropriate \$20,000 to remove the water.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. If we remove the water the hyacinths will not grow. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It would not take that much to remove the water from most of the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bayou Queue de Tortue, La.: For maintenance, \$3,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think we had an understanding last night that if we met at 11 o'clock we would quit at this time to-night. It will be 5.30 before the House adjourns.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 12193, the river and harbor appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. SHERLEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 14303) making appropriations for fortifications and other work for defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed. (H. Rept. 498.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### MINORITY VIEWS ON PHILIPPINE BILL.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, I have presented a report on the bill S. 381, and I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. MANN. What is the bill?

Mr. GARRETT. It is not necessary to report it in this way. I am asking unanimous consent that the minority may have five days in which to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Insular Affairs have five days in which to file their views on the bill S. 381. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing therein some observations which I made on the McLemore resolution, and have not been put in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the McLemore resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, is to-morrow pension day?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do you expect to go ahead right away with this bill, or has the Pension Committee something to call up? Or do they waive their rights?

Mr. KITCHIN. They do not object to it.

Mr. MANN. I am well aware that under the action of the Democratic caucus they can not object to it.

Mr. KITCHIN. They could, but I understand there is nothing from that committee.

Mr. MANN. We just wanted to know for information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military



Academy at West Point René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba;

S. 585. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Sisseton and Walhapon Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States;

S. 922. An act for the relief of Mary E. Nicolson; and

S. 707. An act for the relief of Beverly E. Whitehead.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a little address by the Hon. William H. Calder, a former Member of this House and a candidate for United States Senator in the State of New York, on the subject of preparedness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 7, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1417) to erect or purchase, or both, a factory for the manufacture of armor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 497), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 499), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and a memorial were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 14296) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Interior immediately to develop oil-producing lands belonging to the public domain, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 14297) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sanford, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 14298) to standardize the barrel of lime; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 14299) to amend section 33 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 14300) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Duquesne, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14301) to increase the pay of United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 14302) to provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service of the United States of America, the establishment of a civil-service superannuation and disability pension system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 14303) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. MADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 194) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the lobbying activities of the Du Pont Powder Co. and others; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARNHART: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 26) authorizing the printing of the journal of the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LOBECK: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the bankruptcy laws, as prepared by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring adequate preparedness for the Army and Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14304) granting a pension to Sidonia Lanitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14305) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 14306) granting an increase of pension to James R. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14307) granting an increase of pension to Michael Sowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14308) granting a pension to Lyda Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 14309) granting an increase of pension to Tillie E. Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 14310) granting a pension to Thompson S. Lozan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14311) granting a pension to Patrick McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14312) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dippre; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14313) granting a pension to Sue E. Madden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 14314) granting a pension to Sarah C. Daisey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 14315) granting a pension to Mary A. Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14316) for the relief of the widow of Patrick F. McDermott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 14317) to reinstate Joseph Thaddeus Zak as a cadet at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 14318) granting a pension to Frank L. Schaarman, alias Frank L. Sherman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14319) granting an increase of pension to Levi Essick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14320) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Curran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14321) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 14322) granting a pension to Emily Zapf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14323) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Masters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 14324) removing the restrictions of Nancy Smith; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14325) to enroll Robert Underwood; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 14326) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 14327) granting a pension to Louisa C. Younker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14328) granting a pension to Benjamin Jadwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 14329) granting an increase of pension to Clark K. Denny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14330) for the relief of James W. Kingon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14331) granting an increase of pension to Harriett A. Langston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14332) for the relief of the estate of Robert P. Paramore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 14333) granting a pension to Hulda E. Bryant, former widow of John W. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14334) granting an increase of pension to Laura Liming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 14335) granting a pension to Elizabeth Muller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 14336) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas; to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Manila Merchants' Association; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), memorial of Murray Post, No. 179, Grand Army of the Republic, indorsing Senate bill 392 and House bill 386; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Memorial of Republican State convention at Topeka, Kans., favoring national woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bert H. Simpson and other citizens of Doniphan County, Kans., against passage of bills to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of residents of Gettysburg and Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 13342, to improve and maintain certain public roads and parts thereof included within the limits of the national park at Gettysburg, as defined by the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a national military park at Gettysburg, Pa.," approved February 11, 1895, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13353, for relief of Martin Frey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 200 people of Freeland, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of citizens of the twelfth Indiana district, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of the twelfth Indiana district, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring House bill 6915, relative to employees of the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Petition of 23 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of Local Union No. 97 of National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Mount Clemens, Mich., in support of the Linthicum resolution for Federal inspection of dairies and dairy products; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Alvin Baerwolf and 12 other citizens of the seventh congressional district of Michigan, for an embargo on shipment of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Speaker Baptist Church, of Melvin, Sanilac County; session of First Presbyterian Church of Lapeer; the Methodist Episcopal Church of North Branch; C. E. Crissman and 19 other citizens of Macomb County; and 11 citizens of Melvin, all in the State of Michigan, asking speedy passage of Webb-Smith national prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of F. J. Jenkins and 19 other farmers of Tuscola County and Mrs. Arthur E. Moore and 28 other members of Fremont Grange, No. 654, of Sanilac County, Mich., protesting against Madden amendment limiting size of parcel-post packages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CROSSER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, opposing House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CONRY (by request): Petition of certain citizens of St. Helena, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of United States penitentiary guards at Leavenworth, Kans., for increase of pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARROW: Petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., in behalf of woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to House bills 6468 and 491, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Hill and Valley Club of Hayward, Cal., favoring Senate joint resolution 132, relative to citizenship of North American Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petitions of Henry Torrance and J. M. Etzel Co., of New York City, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of the Men's Club of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, of Chicago, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of United States penitentiary guards at Leavenworth, Kans., for increase of pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of officers of the Massachusetts Squadron of cavalry, favoring organization of a permanent New England regiment of cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of Mrs. Marion E. Kemmer and 77 other members of the Federation of Women's Clubs, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for favorable action by the House of Representatives on House bill 6915; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles L. McElroy and 198 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of House bill 6915; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 14099, for relief of James Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petitions of citizens of Dunn Center, Killdeer, Werner, Taylor, Renville, Halliday, Emerson, Mandan, Bismarck, Manning, Kulm, Marie, Forbes, Wirth, McClusky, Niagara, Pilot, McCanna, Shawnee, Leonard, Doyon, Crary, Zenith, and Belfield, all in the State of North Dakota, protesting against the enactment of House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOPWOOD: Petition of Church of the Brethren, of Paint Township; Burden Bearers S. S. C., of Windber; 40 people of Stoyestown, 250 people of Stoyestown, and 150 people of Stoyestown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Washington against passage of bills for Sunday closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petitions of F. H. Hitchcock and 11 other residents of Fenton; E. C. Van De Walker and 6 other residents of Mount Morris; and John A. Bradley and 7 other residents of Holly, all in the State of Michigan, favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Frank Dzwiewiecki and 50 other members of Vine Grange, No. 744, of Tawas City, Mich., against the Madden rider in Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petitions of sundry citizens and societies in the State of New York favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAPES: Memorial of Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Lamont, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Seattle (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce urging appropriation for providing a halibut boat for north Pacific waters; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of guards of United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., for increase of pay; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of 62 citizens of the city of Red Bluff, and A. M. Todd and others, of Placerville, all in the State of California, against passage of bills to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. M. Todd and others, of Placerville, Cal., against the Sunday observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of W. S. Brown, of Brooklyn, indorsing House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.



Also, petition of George Y. Davison, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring censorship of picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of American Temperance Board of Indianapolis, Ind., indorsing the Sheppard-Barkley bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co., of New York, opposing House bill 8036; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Van Blerck Motor Co., of Monroe, Mich., opposing House bill 9411; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Knights of Columbus Institute of Brooklyn, N. Y., in re preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Rev. J. H. Johnson, pastor of the Swedish Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Dalbo, Minn., favoring peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens and organization of the State of Minnesota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. E. Johnson and members of the Almelund Farmers' Club of Minnesota, favoring investigation of monopoly in twine industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT of Michigan: Memorial of Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of New Jersey Senate, indorsing House bill 11250 and Senate bill 703; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of New Jersey Senate, favoring erection of an archives building in Washington; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of New Jersey Senate, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, in re industrial efficiency; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America and of the National Grange, in re legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of 34 citizens of Esplee, favoring passage of Senate bill 2986, relative to Federal farm-loan system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Rev. J. C. M. Johnston, New Wilmington, Pa., opposing the Shields water-power bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of T. H. Sawhill and Post No. 555, Grand Army of the Republic, of Claysville, Pa., favoring House bill 11707, a bill granting an increase of pension to soldiers' widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Washington Branch (Pa.) Socialist Party, favoring House joint resolution 137, prohibiting sectarian appropriations and opposing House bills 401 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution signed by Rev. H. Edward Cottrell, in behalf of the Hoover Heights Gospel Tabernacle, of New Castle, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution signed by John Richardson and adopted by the Maitland Memorial Church, of New Castle, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution signed by Mr. Thomas E. Dagg and 16 other citizens of Washington County, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by Mr. J. H. McClure in behalf of the Wilmington Grange, No. 1477, New Wilmington, Pa., in support of the Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

Also, petition signed by Mr. J. H. McClure, in behalf of the Wilmington Grange, No. 1477, New Wilmington, Pa., protesting against preparedness and favoring the manufacture of munitions of war by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Harrisville, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial on preparedness presented by Mr. Scott Munnell, of New Castle, Pa., in behalf of Willard Grange, No. 1440, New Castle, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of Major How Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, by G. W. Heath, post commander, and F. S. Bradley, adjutant, requesting passage of so-called Ashbrook widows' pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 7, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

## NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Washington, D. C.

To the Senate:

The Vice President being absent from the Senate, and the undersigned being also necessarily absent therefrom, he, as President pro tempore of the Senate, hereby names the Senator from New York, Mr. JAMES A. O'GORMAN, to perform the duties of the Chair on the 7th day of April, 1916, this substitution not to extend beyond an adjournment.

JAMES P. CLARKE,

President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. O'GORMAN thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

## COAST DEFENSES IN CALIFORNIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'GORMAN) laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of War, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 5, 1916.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a statement showing the coast defenses in the State of California, how they are manned, and the number and kind of guns in each fort, and to request that this statement be substituted for a statement on the same subjects transmitted under date of March 31, 1916, in response to Senate resolution of March 27, 1916, which original statement was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 4, 1916.

Subsequently to the transmission of the original statement to the Senate under date of March 31, it was found that the statement was arranged in such form as to be misleading, and as likely to convey an erroneous impression as to the seacoast armament in the State of California that can be manned by the available personnel, including both the personnel of the Regular Coast Artillery and that of the California Militia Coast Artillery. The statement now inclosed, which is for substitution for the original statement, shows the actual condition of affairs in this respect.

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12706) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at the close of section 29, to be known as section 29a.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 29a. In addition to military training soldiers while in the active service shall hereafter be given the opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines preparatory for their return to civil life, and, when practicable, an average of 94 hours monthly shall be devoted to such work. Civilian teachers may be employed to aid the Army officers in giving such instruction, and part of this preparation for civil life shall consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts. The Secretary of War, with the approval of the President, shall prescribe rules and regulations for conducting the instruction herein provided for.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	du Pont	Myers	Smoot
Beckham	Gallinger	Norris	Sterling
Brady	Harding	O'Gorman	Swanland
Brandeggee	Hardwick	Oliver	Swanson
Broussard	Hitchcock	Overman	Taggart
Burleigh	Husting	Owen	Thomas
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thompson
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Tillman
Chilton	Jones	Ransdell	Townsend
Clapp	Kenyon	Reed	Underwood
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Robinson	Vardaman
Coit	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Culberson	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Cummins	McCumber	Sherman	Weeks
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Simmons	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Goff] on account of illness.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].